Nina Andreyeva

UNPRESENTED PRINCIPLES

or

A Brief History of Perestroika

(Selected Articles and Speeches)

A.I. BELITSKY
Compiler of the Collection of Articles,
Writer of Notes, Foreword and Afterword

FOREWORD

Dear Readers,

The course of writing this collection of articles was difficult. The so-called glasnost and pluralism gave only the "architects" of perestroika and of the post-perestroika period green light to the means of mass information. Millions of copies of the writings of phrasemongers and "those seeking power" filled bookstores and booths. Their true aim is to justify themselves before their younger generation and history and conceal their crime, opportunism and treachery by diverting the readers with the details of "Kremlin secrets."

It is a different matter with this collection. Most of the essays and speeches included in it are known to like-minded people and many Soviet citizens, but some of them are published for the first time, because it is not allowed to carry them in the newspapers and magazines of the present pluralistic society. However, it is impossible to stop the path to truth.

In December 1991 in the very heat of the events which were destructive for the USSR, the newspaper *Pravda* office, jointly with the humanitarian centre of social technology, heard public opinion with the aim of bringing out the "person of the year". Nina Alexandrovna Andreyeva, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Bolshevik Communist Party (ABCP), was found among the first ten best people. Summing up this hearing of public opinion, *Pravda* wrote in its article: "Nina Andreyeva declared herself at once and for a long time. Some people understood her and supported her, and some people doubt her truthfulness even now. However, her faith knows no vacillation. This is her principal personal trait which calls forth approval and admiration even from those who do not share her views. She is taken as good woman of not only principle, but also consistent action, as an honest, frank, sincere and sociable one."

It should be noted that she was endowed with the firmness of her belief and the persistence in upholding her life principle. The "person of the year" was born into a worker's family in Leningrad, and like many people of her age, in 1941 she lost her father, who fell in action on the front. She finished a secondary school with a gold medal, graduated from a technological institute as a top-honoured student and became master of engineering. She joined the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in 1966. More than once she entered into a conflict with the bureaucratic leadership, demanding that the party's words and action accord with each other. For this they twice attempted to deprive her of her party card, and that those

who themselves abandoned their party cards in the years of perestroika.

Press evidences of faith of Nina Andreyeva of that time have also been preserved. The newspaper *Leningrad Pravda* dated August 1, 1970 wrote in its article *One Step Aside* about the conflict of Communist Andreyeva with the corrupted leadership of the institute of quartz glass where she worked after she had defended her thesis for the degree of Master of Science: "The young communist appeared at the institute not long ago. But, Andreyeva saw many things to which people here have been accustomed shutting their eyes for years. She did not want to keep silence. So she began to express her opinion openly at party meetings. And she dared to criticize. In short she took a step aside from that beaten road along which research workers had to go if they wanted to consolidate their official status at the institute."

That was why they attempted to expel her from the CPSU. However, at that time the workers-communists of the institute rose up to side with her, and the degenerates themselves had to part with their leading armchairs.

So far as the education of N.A. Andreyeva is concerned, she is a chemical engineer, an instructor of physical chemistry, the author of more than one hundred essays published in scientific-technical magazines and collections of papers. In other words, she is a "narrow" specialist. Because of this, critics came to doubt whether she herself could write her well-known letter "I Cannot Give Up Principles," published in the newspaper *Soviet Russia* dated March 13, 1988. They ascribed it even to E.K. Ligachev, the then member of the Politburo, and Secretary, of the CC of the CPSU and to his "party". Who could foresee at that time that people of new type, who would not go along the road of capitulation, opportunism and conciliation beaten by party bureaucrats, would appear within the communist party against the turbulent political background of ruinous society? Her successive writings and speeches delivered to the masses removed all the doubts related to her authorship of the letter published in *Soviet Russia.*

Her essays and speeches elucidated the dramatic course of Gorbachev-style perestroika and the tragedy of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. Their author is not an onlooker of the critical processes, but an active fighter for socialism and for the interests of the working people.

This collection serves as an original chronicle of the contradictory events of the last five years in the history of Russia, an analytic and critical chronicle expounded in accordance with the social philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, free from the revisionist vulgarization of the "new political thinking."

* * *

Her first pen test in the sphere of politics was given in a short piece published in the newspaper *Leningrad Worker* which restorationists stopped publishing. Her original manuscript entitled "Future in Recollection?" which had been submitted to the editorial board was three to four times larger in volume than the published article. It is part of her response to the interview given by A. Prokhanov, a well-known writer, to the *Leningrad Worker* dated July 24, 1987. In this interview acute problems concerning perestroika were touched upon.

The writer succeeded in avoiding schematic thinking and in giving various interesting philosophical thought which provoked animated controversy. The editorial board of the newspaper published N. Andreyeva's response under the title "Future in Recollection?" which did not reflect the content of the article.

FUTURE IN RECOLLECTION?

I read the interview of writer Alexandr Prokhanov with great interest. I made up my mind to express immediately my attitude toward the raised problems, but when I read the text carefully, many things occurred to me. After the exchange of opinions with my acquaintances and friends, I went deeper into the newspaper article. As a result of this the "Thought on the Future" was prepared.

Alexandr Prokhanov is intimate to me not only as a man of my age, as an engineer, but also as a writer whose pen is devoted to a Soviet man who is creating and defending socialist society. I consider his novel, *The Tree at the Centre of Kabul,* one of the best in our literature during the current decade. At the talk the idea of the writer slided from the beaten track of the usual frames of mind, that's why it imperiously compelled one to think deeply of the destiny of our motherland once again.

I fully share the uneasiness of Prokhanov for some signs of the weakening of the leading role of the party, for the aggravation of social contradictions, for the phenomena objectively leading to detriment to the friendship between the peoples and the moral and political unity of society, and to the demolition of the "state ship". I agree that nothing good will be promised to us by compromises in the sphere of ideology and culture, by the solution of social development through the method of tests and mistakes, by the threats of loss of the "idea of social justice," and by the bourgeois pacifist erosion of the "defence consciousness" elaborated during years of socialist construction. Of course, it is impossible to agree to all the conclusions and appraisals of the writer.

In my opinion, the value of the position of the writer lies in that his idea is dictated by an aching heart, that it calls forth a frank talk, that it leads to meditation and to the aspiration to discover even the truth which slips away. I express my thanks for this.

Prokhanov writes: "All the passions in social consciousness and in the press are today connected with the attacks against Stalin and against the superstate created by him in his time". He is right.

Maybe, actually, there are no more pressing problems for us today than the discussions about the complicated and contradictory phenomena of half a century's remoteness, are there? At the same time, a shadow is cast on the transitional period to socialism which is the most complicated in the history of the country, and on the unparalleled exploit of a whole generation of the Soviet people.

The writer is right also in that ours has turned into a country "which studies Marx badly". Yes, in a number of our periodical publications the term "Marxism-Leninism" is no longer in use imperceptibly. Even if they appeal to the founders of Marxism-Leninism, they take their position not in development and wholeness, but snatch individual quotations from the context, even forgetting to give footnotes. However, is it possible to "prove" anything they like in such a way? The most important and essential in Marxism-Leninism–the theory of the world-historic mission of the working class–is completely neglected. It is neglected namely at the time when imperialism threatens the existence of mankind on the earth and when the significance and the general character of this mission have immeasurably increased. I sometimes think: Are there really those who truly think that we could, in the shortest historic period, have created modern industry and a war industry and prepare, with our own efforts, the active defence of the country the strength of which was verified in the fight against fascism, without severe centralization of control of social and economic processes, without ideological and political consolidation, and by resting upon the principles of market economy?

The thought of the writer about the Russian problems is similar to mine. There is no doubt that "only an idiot or a plotter can repeat the words about the superiority of the Russian nation". However, there is no need for great intellect and decency in order to forget the national pride of the Great Russians. Can it be explained that "our national idea has a rear-guard and protective character" only by the national expenditures, losses and pains? As in a family, so in our "multilingual fraternity" of the Soviet people the role of the elder brother, being connected with certain losses, is incompatible with national and racial egoism and the idea of national exclusiveness.

We are somehow ashamed of uttering that namely the Russian proletariat accomplished "three Russian revolutions" in the 20th century (Lenin), that in the advanced guard of the fight of the mankind against fascism were the Slav peoples (the Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, Byelorussians, Slovakians, Yugoslavs and other nations), and that the toast proposed by Stalin "to the Russian people!" at the party for the generals in 1945 did not reflect the political conjuncture but profound historic truth.*

In his interview the writer raised yet another problem which seems to be of extraordinary importance for the destiny of socialism. "It is necessary", he says, "to create the market, the bank and the

communications of idea so that our society will be filled with ideas. Let there be their dialogue and fight". It is quite right. Ideological development and theoretical conception should outstrip the socio-economic process. The conditions for this are available in our country. The only problem is: What kind of ideas? The author goes on: "It is necessary to create the most favourable surroundings for socialist ideas and cultivate them". So, the socialist and non-socialist ideas will start to compete in the ideological market of the country. I think that such ideological pluralism (the inmost dream of all the anti-communists) will not bring anything good. We should remember how dearly we paid for the ideological consolidation of society, a society which is now so easily suggested to be repudiated, having yielded the field of battle to the class enemy. Without ideological consolidation the moral and political unity of society, the friendship among the peoples and, accordingly, socialism itself will be of no great significance.**

N. Andreyeva,
Master of Technical Sciences,
Instructor of Leningrad Soviet Technological Institute

Leningrad Worker, October 9, 1987, page 4

---

*Speech of Comrade J.V. Stalin at the party in honour of the commanders of the Red Army on May 24, 1945:

"Comrades, permit me to propose one more toast, the last one. I would like to drink to the health of our Soviet people and, before anything else, of the Russian people. (*Stormy, prolonged applause and shouts of hurrah*.)

"I drink, first of all, to the health of the Russian people because they are the most distinguished nation of all the nations which form the Soviet Union.

"I propose this toast to the health of the Russian people because they were generally recognized in this war as the leading force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country.

"I drink this toast to the health of the Russian people not only because they are a leading people, but also because they have a clear mind, staunch character and endurance.

"Our government committed many mistakes, and in 1941-1942 we had a time during which we were in a desperate condition when our army retreated, leaving our dear villages and towns of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldavia, the Leningrad region, the Baltic area and the Karelo-Finnish Republic; they left them because there was no other way out. Another people might have said to the Government: You have not justified our expectations. Go away. We will set up another government which will make peace with Germany and ensure us tranquility. However, the Russian people did not do so, for they believed the correctness of the policy of their Government and were determined to fight self-sacrificingly to defeat Germany. And this confidence of the Russian people in the Soviet Government was the decisive strength which ensured the historic victory over the enemy of mankind–fascism.

"I would like to express my thanks to the Russian people for their trust.

"To the health of the Russian people! (*Stormy, prolonged applause*.)"

**After the discussion A. Prokhanov published his second interview in the *Leningrad Worker* on January 2, 1988, in which he continually advocated his views which were evidently erroneous. Letters were again sent to the editorial board of the

newspaper. N.A. Andreyeva also sent her response in 18 pages. However, the editorial board decided not to publish it. Continuing to take part in the discussion of the burning problems of perestroika, she sent the copies of her responses to the editorial boards of the newspapers *Pravda, Leningrad Pravda, Literary Newspaper, Soviet Russia*....

On February 23 the editorial board of *Soviet Russia* phoned her and suggested to prepare an article for the newspaper, using the materials of her two responses. They put forward a number of conditions and told her about the limit of the date. N.A. Andreyeva worked up the material and reduced it to one-third. On March 9 V.N. Denisov, editor of the newspaper, came to Leningrad. The article was handed over to him. With minimum correction and curtailment they prepared the material for publication. On March 13 it was published on the debate column as a letter to the newspaper under the title "I Cannot Give Up Principles". Soon this letter was reprinted in 937 republican, regional, municipal and branch newspapers, not including factory newspapers and the newspapers of military units.

In Leningrad, at the House of Culture named after Marx there was held a discussion about this publication with the participation of the correspondents of *Soviet Russia*, and the majority of the speakers supported N.A. Andreyeva's position.

* * *

I CANNOT GIVE UP PRINCIPLES

I decided to write this letter after long meditation. I am a chemist and an instructor at the Leningrad Technological Institute named after Lensoviet. Like many others, I am also a curator of one class. In our days, after the period of social apathy and intellectual parasitism, students gradually begin to be charged with energy for revolutionary changes. Naturally, there arise discussions about the ways of perestroika and about its economic and ideological aspects. Glasnost, opening, disappearance of the zones forbidden for criticism, the emotional incandescence in the consciousness of the masses, amidst the young people in particular, are shown not infrequently also in the raising of such problems, which are "prompted" in one or another measure by the Western radios or by those of our countrymen who are not thorough in their understanding of the essence of socialism. What is not talked about! Talk is going about the multi-party system, about the freedom of religious propaganda, about leaving the country to reside abroad, about the right to wide discussion of sexual problems in the press, about the need of decentralized leadership of culture, and about the abolition of obligatory military service.... There is particularly a lot of argument among students about the past of the country.

Of course, we instructors have to answer the most acute problems which demand, besides honesty, knowledge, conviction, cultural horizon, serious meditation and profound appreciations. And these qualities are needed for all the educators of the young people, and not only for the collaborators of the chairs of social sciences.

The favorite place where we go with students for a walk is the park in Petergof. We walk along the snow-covered lanes, admire the famous places and statues, and argue. Argue! Young souls thirst for understanding all the complications and determine their path for the future. I watch my young excited interlocutors and think: How important it is to help them to discover truth, form a correct understanding of the problems of the society in which they are living and which is to be reformed by them and how I should clarify for them the right understanding of the ancient and recent of our history.

What are the apprehensions? Here is a simple example: it seems that so much has been written and told about the Great Patriotic War and about the heroism of its participants. But, now long ago there was a meeting with Hero of the Soviet Union V.F. Molozev, a retired colonel, in one of the student hostels of our technological institute. Among others a question was raised to him about the political repression in the army. The veteran answered that he had not run into repression, and that many of those who, together with him, had gone through the war from the start to the end, became important military commanders.... Some were disappointed to hear the answer. Being a topic of conversation, the matter of repression is hypertrophied among some young people, and overshadows the objective comprehension of the past. Instances of this kind are not rare.

Of course, it makes me very glad that even the "technical scholars" are keenly interested in the theoretical problems of social science. However, too many of such problems have already appeared which I cannot accept and to which I cannot agree. They are words about "terrorism", "political servility of the people", "uninspired social vegetation", "our spiritual slavery", "general fear", and "dominance of the boors in power".... Only out of these threads is frequently woven the history of the transitional period to socialism in our country. Therefore, it is not surprising that, for instance, among some students nihilistic frames of mind are growing, and ideological confusion, displacement of political landmarks and even ideological polyphagia are appearing. Sometimes we hear the assertion that it is time to make communists answerable for having allegedly "dehumanized" the life of the country after 1917.

At the February Plenary Meeting of the Party Central Committee the imperative necessity was once again stressed for the "young people to be taught to see the world from the class point of view and understand the relations between the universal and class interests, including the class essence of the changes taking place in our country". Such view of history and of the present is incompatible with the political anecdotes, base gossips and sharp fantasies, which it is now possible to encounter frequently.

I read and reread the sensational articles. What can, for instance, be given to the youth, except disorientation, by the revelation of the "counterrevolution in the USSR in the '30s", of the "blame" of Stalin for the accession to power by fascism and Hitler in Germany, or by the public "counting" of the number of "Stalinists" among vari-

ous generations and social groups?

We are inhabitants of Leningrad, and therefore we have recently seen a good documentary about S.M. Kirov with particular interest. However, the text, accompanying stills, not only differed from the scenes of the film in some passages, but also gave them some ambiguity. For one thing, the stills demonstrate the outburst of enthusiasm, the joy of living, and the emotional upsurge of people who have built socialism, but the announcer's text refers to repression and ignorance....

Probably, it was evident not only to me that the appeals of party leaders to turn the attention of the "denouncers" also to the facts of real achievements at different stages of socialist construction call forth new outbreaks of "disclosures" as if on order. Noticeable in this unfruitful play are the plays of M. Shatrov. On the day when the 26th Congress of the party opened I had occasion to see the performance of *Blue Roots at Red Grass* . I remember the excited reaction of the young people in the episode of Lenin's secretary trying to pour water on the Lenin's head from a tea-kettle, having confused it with an unfinished sculptural model. By the way, some young people came with slogan-boards which had been prepared beforehand and meant to besmirch our past and present.... In the play *Brest Peace* Lenin kneels to Trotsky according to the will of the playwright and the director. This is a symbolic embodiment of the author's conception. It is subsequently developed in the play *Farther, Farther and Farther!* Of course, a play is not a historic treatise. However, even in artistic production truth is provided by none other than the position of the author. It is particularly so if dramatic works on political subjects are referred to,

The position of playwright Shatrov is analysed thoroughly and in a well-reasoned way in the reviews of scholars-historians published in the newspapers *Pravda* and *Soviet Russia**. I would also like to express my opinion. I cannot agree specifically to the fact that Shatrov substantially deviates from the accepted principles of socialist realism. Dealing with the most responsible period in the history of our country, he absolutizes the subjective factor of social progress, obviously ignores the objective laws of history which are manifested in the activity of the classes and masses. The role of the proletarian masses and the party of Bolsheviks is brought down here to the "background" in which the activities of irresponsible politicians are being unfolded.

The reviewers, resting upon the Marxist-Leninist methodology of the investigation of concrete historic processes, convincingly testified that Shatrov distorts the history of socialism in our country. The unacceptable object is the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, without the historic contribution of which there would be nothing to reorganize for us now. Furthermore, the author accuses Stalin of the murder of Trotsky and Kirov and of the "blockade" of sick Lenin. However, it is really inconceivable to throw biased

accuses against historic figures, without taking trouble to show evidences....

Unfortunately, the reviewers did not succeed in showing that the playwright is not original for all his pretensions as an author. It seemed to me that in the logic of his appraisal and argument he was very close to the motif of B. Suvarin's book published in Paris in 1935. In the play Shatrov put into the mouths of the characters what had been asserted by the opponents of Leninism concerning the course of the revolution, Lenin's role in it and the mutual relations of the members of the Party Central Committee at different stages of inner-party struggle.... Such is the essence of Shatrov's "new perusal" about Lenin. I would like to add that A. Rybakov, author of *Children of Arbat,* also frankly admitted that individual plots had been borrowed by Shatrov from emigrant publications.

Without reading the play *Farther, Farther and Farther!* (it was not published) I had already read laudatory responses to it in some publications. What could such haste mean? Then I knew that hasty preparations were being made to put the play on the stage.

Soon after the February Plenary Meeting in *Pravda* was published a letter which was entitled "Along a New Circle" and signed by our eight leading theatrical figures. They warn against the possible, according to their opinion, delay in the staging of M. Shatrov's latest play. This conclusion is made from the critical appreciations of the play which had appeared in newspapers. The authors of the letter put, for some reason, the authors of the critical reviews outside the brackets of those "for whom the fatherland is dear." How does it go with their wish to discuss the problems of our ancient and recent history "stormily and passionately?" Do they mean that only they may have their opinion?**

In the numerous discussions now being held literally on all problems of sociology, I, as an instructor of a higher educational institution, am interested first of all in those problems which directly exert influence on the ideological and political education of the young people, their moral health and their social optimism. Talking to students, meditating on acute problems together with them, I involuntarily come to the conclusion that many shortcomings and one-sidedness have been accumulated in us, something which evidently needs to be corrected. I would like to dwell especially on some of them.

Let us take the problem about the place of J.V. Stalin in the history of our country. Namely with his name is connected all the obsession of the critical attacks which, in my opinion, concerns not so much the very historic person as all the most complicated transitional period, a period which has to do with the unparalleled exploit of the whole generation of the Soviet people who are now gradually moving away from active working, political and social activity. The industrialization, collectivization and cultural revolution which have led out our country to the ranks of the great powers, are forcibly

being crammed into the formula of "personality cult". All this is put under doubt. Things have come to such an extent that they have begun to persistently demand "Stalinists" to "confess". (It is possible to include in their number anyone if it is desired to do so).... Praises are showered upon the novels and films in which the era of storm and onslaught is lynched being described as the "tragedy of the people." It is true that sometimes similar attempts to erect historic nihilism on the pedestal do not work. So, a film which is rained with kisses of criticism, is sometimes accepted rather coldly by the majority of the population in spite of the unprecedented publicity pressing.

I would like to mention straight away that neither I nor other members of my family have any relation with Stalin, with his surroundings, his retinue and with his extollers. My father was a worker of the Leningrad Port and my mother was a metal worker at Kirov Factory. My elder brother also worked there. He, my father and sister were killed in the battles with Hitlerites. One of my relatives had been repressed and after the 20th Congress of the party he was rehabilitated. Together with all the Soviet people I share wrath and indignation for the mass repression which took place in the 30s and 40s because of the fault of the then party and state leadership. However, common sense resolutely protests against the one-colour painting of contradictory events which has now begun to prevail in some press organs.

I support the party's call to defend the honour and dignity of the pioneers of socialism. I think that precisely from these party and class positions we should appraise the historic role of all the leaders of the party and the country including Stalin. In this case we should not reduce the matter to the "court" aspect or to abstract moral propaganda from the side of those persons who are far both from that stormy time and from people who lived and worked at that time so that it serves as an inspiring example for us even now.

For me, like for many people, a decisive role in the appraisal of Stalin is played by the direct evidences of the contemporaries who had firsthand contact with him both on our side and on the other side of the barricade. Not uninteresting are just the evidences of the latter. Take, for instance, Churchill, who in 1919 took pride in his personal contribution to the organization of military intervention of 14 foreign states against the young Soviet Republic, but exactly after forty years was compelled to characterize Stalin, one of his menacing political opponents, as follows:

"He was an outstanding person impressing our severe time of the period in which his life elapsed. Stalin was a man of exceptional energy, erudition and unbending willpower, harsh, strict and relentless as in work, so in talk, whom even I, educated in English parliament, could not oppose in any way.... In his works gigantic strength was resounded. In Stalin this strength was so great that he seemed unique among the leaders of all times and peoples.... His influence

on people was irresistible. When he entered the hall of the Yalta Conference, all of us stood up as if at someone's command. A strange thing is that we stood at attention. Stalin possessed profound, logical and intelligent wisdom devoid of any panic. He was a peerless master able to find, at a difficult moment, a way out of the most hopeless situation.... This was a man who destroyed his enemy with the hands of his enemies, and forced us, whom he openly called imperialists, to fight against imperialists.... He took over Russia with a wooden plough, but left it equipped with atomic weapons". Such an appraisal-confession on the part of a loyal guardsman of the British empire cannot be explained as a pretence or political conjuncture.

The basic elements of this characteristic can be found also in the memoirs of De Gaulle and in the reminiscences and letters of other political figures of Europe and America, who dealt with Stalin as a military ally and a class enemy.

Important and serious material for meditation on the given problem is given by home documents, which are, moreover, available for all comers. Take, for instance, the two-volume edition *Letters of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Exchanged with the Presidents of the USA and the Prime-Ministers of Great Britain during the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945*, issued by the Publishing House of Political Books already in 1957. These documents really call forth pride in our state and in its place and role in the stormy and changing world. I remember the collection of reports, speeches and orders given by Stalin in the years of the last war with which the heroic generation of those who won victory over fascism were educated. It may well be republished with the inclusion of those documents which were secret at that time, such as the dramatic order No. 227. *** By the way, some historians insist on doing so. All these documents are not known to our young people. What is particularly important for the education of historic consciousness is the memoirs of generals Zhukov, Vasilevsky, Golovanov and Shtemenko and aircraft designer Yakovlev who knew the Supreme Commander-in-Chief not by hearsay.

It goes without saying that the time was extremely severe. And it is also true that personal modesty, amounting to asceticism, was not yet ashamed of itself, and that the potential Soviet millionaires still feared to peck in the tranquility of demoted offices and commercial bases. Moreover, we were not so business-like and pragmatic and did not prepare the young people for the niceties of using the wealth earned by their parents, but for labour and defence, without shattering their spiritual world with alien chef d'oeuvres from behind the "hillock" and with clumsy articles of mass culture.

From the long and frank talks with young interlocutors we draw such conclusions that the attacks on the state of dictatorship of the proletariat and the then leaders of our country have not only political, ideological and moral causes, but also their own social subsoil.

There are not a small number of those who are interested in expanding the bridgehead of these attacks, and they are not only beyond the boundaries of our country. Side by side with the professional anti-communists in the West, who chose the allegedly democratic slogan of "anti-Stalinism" a long time ago, there live and prosper the descendants of the classes overthrown by the October Revolution, not all of whom could forget the material and social losses of their ancestors. We should relate to this the spiritual heirs to Dan and Martov and others of the department of Russian social-democratism, the spiritual followers of Trotsky and Yogoda, and the offspring of nepmen, Basmaches and kulaks who were offended by socialism.

As is known, every historic figure is developed by concrete socio-economic and ideological and political conditions, which exert a decisive influence on the subjective-objective selection of the pretenders whose mission is to solve some or other social problems. Such a pretender who had moved forward to the proscenium of history should, in order "to remain afloat", satisfy the requirements of the era and the leading social and political structures and realize in his activity objective law, having inevitably left the "imprint" of his personality on historic events. In the final analysis, for instance, there are now a few of those who are embarrassed by the personal qualities of Peter the Great, but everyone remembers that during the period of his rule the country reached the level of a great European power. Time has condensed the result, which lies now in the appraisal of the historic personality of Emperor Peter. And the invariable flowers on his sarcophagus at the cathedral of Petropavlovsk Fortress embody the respect and gratitude of our contemporaries who are distant from autocracy.

I think that, however contradictory and complicated one or another figure of Soviet history may be, its true role in the building and defence of socialism will receive its objective and unequivocal appraisal sooner or later. Of course, unequivocal not in the sense of one-sided, whitewashing or eclectically summarizing discrepant phenomena, which allows one to make with reserves any subjectivism–"to forgive or not to forgive", "to throw out or to leave" in history. Unequivocal means, before anything else, historically concrete appraisal independent of conjuncture, in which is manifested–according to historic result!–dialectics of conformity of the activity of personality with the basic laws of the development of society. In our country these laws were connected with the solution of the problem "who will beat whom?" in the internal and international aspects. If we are to follow the Marxist-Leninist methodology of historic investigation, then, according to M.S. Gorbachev, it is necessary, before anything else, to show strikingly how millions of people lived and laboured and in what they believed, and how the victories and failures, discoveries and mistakes, the bright and tragic, the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses and the violations of socialist law, at times crimes, were combined.

Recently one of my girl students puzzled me by frankly saying that the class struggle was an antiquated conception, like the leading role of the proletariat. It would be all right if only she asserted that. The recent assertion of a respected academician to the effect that the present relations between the states of two different social and economic systems have been deprived of class content, for example, provoked fierce controversy. I assume that the academician did not consider it necessary to explain why he had for decades written about what is directly opposite to this–that peaceful coexistence is nothing else but a form of class struggle in the international arena. It appears that now the philosopher has declined this. Why, views sometimes change. However, I think that the duty of a leading philosopher enjoins him all the same to explain at least to those who learned and are learning according to his books, that the international working class is now countering world capital with its state and political organs.

At the centre of many discussions now being held, there stands, as it seems to me, the question: which class or stratum of society is the leading and mobilizing force of perestroika? Something was said about this, in particular, in the interview of writer A. Prokhanov in our city newspaper *Leningrad Worker*. Prokhanov proceeds from it that the peculiarity of the present status of social consciousness is characterized by the presence of two ideological currents, or, as he says, "alternative towers", which attempt, from various directions, to overcome in our country "socialism built in battles". Exaggerating the significance and sharpness of mutual antagonism between these "towers", the writer, nevertheless, justly emphasizes that "they agree only in the beating of socialist values". However, both, as their ideologues assure, stand "for perestroika".

The first, the deepest ideological current, which has already revealed itself in the course of perestroika, pretends to the model of a sort of Left-liberal intellectual socialism, the alleged mouthpiece of the most veritable and the "purest" humanism free from class stratification. Its supporters oppose to proletarian collectivism the "self-value of personality"–with modernist searches in the field of culture, God-seeking tendencies, technocratic idols, preaching of "democratic" charms of modern capitalism, and flatteries of its real and sham achievements. Its representatives assert that we have built no such socialism and that only now "for the first time in history the union of political leadership and progressive intelligentsia has been formed". At the time when millions of people in our planet die of hunger, epidemics and military adventures of imperialism, they demand to work out a "juridical code of the defence of animals' rights", give nature unusual, supernatural intelligence and maintain that cultural level is not a social, but a biological quality, which is genetically passed from parents to children. Will you explain to me what all this means?

Namely the supporters of "Left-liberal socialism" form the ten-

dency of falsification of the history of socialism. They instil into us that in the past history of the country only mistakes and crimes were real, keeping silence about the greatest attainments of the past and the present. Pretending to the completeness of historic truth, they substitute the social and political criterion of the development of society with scholasticism of ethical categories. I want to know very much for whom and for what it is necessary so that every leader of the CC of the Party and the Soviet government, after leaving his post, was compromised and discredited in connection with his real and alleged mistakes and errors committed in solving the most complicated problems on bad historic roads. From where did come to us such passion for the dissipation of the authority and dignity of the leaders of the first country of socialism in the world?

Another peculiarity of the views of the "Left liberals" is an evident or disguised cosmopolitan tendency, certain "internationalism" without something national. I read somewhere that when after the revolution a delegation of merchants and factory owners came to the Petrograd Soviet, to Trotsky "as a Jew", to lodge a complaint about the oppression of the Red Guards, he declared that he was "not a Jew, but an internationalist", and thus he greatly perplexed the petitioners.

The concept "national", for Trotsky, meant something which has inferiority and limitation in comparison with "internationalism". And, therefore, he emphasized the "national tradition" of October, wrote about "national in Lenin", asserted that the Russian people "did not receive any cultural legacy" and the like. We are somehow ashamed to say that namely the Russian proletariat, whom Trotskyites slighted as being "backward and uncivilized", accomplished, according to Lenin, "three Russian revolutions", and that the Slav peoples advanced in the van of mankind in the battles with fascism.

As a matter of course, saying so does not mean any belittling of the historic contribution of other nations and nationalities. This, as they say today, only ensures the completeness of historic truth.... When the students ask me how it could happen that thousands of small villages in Nechernozem and Siberia became deserted, I answer that this is also a dear price for victory and for the postwar rehabilitation of the national economy, like the irrevocable losses of a large amount of memorials of the Russian national culture. And I still believe that from belittling the significance of historic consciousness springs pacifistic washing away of defensive and patriotic consciousness, and also the striving for recording the slightest manifestations of national pride of Great Russians in the column of maniacal great-power chauvinism.

Another thing that makes me uneasy is that now the practice of "denial" of socialism is connected with militant cosmopolitism. Unfortunately, we became aware of this only when its neophytes were an eyesore to us with their outrages in front of Smolny or under the walls of Kremlin. And what is more, they somehow train

us gradually to see in the mentioned phenomenon some almost inoffensive change of "residence", but not the class and national betrayal of those the majority of whom have finished higher educational institutions and post-graduate studentship with our public means. In general, some people are inclined to see the "denial" as some manifestation of "democracy" and the "rights of a man" whose talent was prevented from blossoming out because of "stagnant socialism". Well, if, even there, in the "free world", the seething enterprise and "genius" are not appreciated and the bargaining of conscience is not of interest for the intelligence agencies, they may come back....

As is generally known, according to the concrete historic role, K. Marx and F. Engels called whole nations "counterrevolutionary" at a definite epoch of their history–I emphasize, not classes, not estates, but namely nations. On the foundation of class viewpoint they were not ashamed to give sharp characteristics to a number of nations, including the Russians, Poles, and also to those nationalities to which they themselves belonged. The founders of scientific-proletarian world outlook remind us that, in the fraternal concord of the Soviet peoples every nation and nationality should "cherish honour ever since youth", not allow itself to be provoked to national and chauvinistic frames of mind. The national pride and national dignity of each people should be organically combined with the internationalism of the single socialist society.

If the "neo-liberals" orientate themselves to the West, another "alternative tower", according to Prokhanov's expression, the "protectors and traditionalists", strive "to overcome socialism by backward movement". In other words, they strive to return to the social forms of pre-socialist Russia. The representatives of this peculiar "peasant socialism" are charmed by this mode. According to their opinion, a hundred years ago there was a loss of moral values, accumulated in the haze of centuries of peasant community. The "traditionalists" have unquestionable merits in the exposure of corruption, in the fair solution of ecological problems, in the struggle against alcoholism, in the defence of historic memorials, in the fight against the dominance over mass culture, which is justly appreciated as the psychosis of consumption....

At the same time, in the views of the ideologues of "peasant socialism" there are found the misunderstanding of the historic significance of October for the destiny of the fatherland, one-sided appraisal of collectivization as "terrible tyranny in relation to the peasantry", uncritical views of the religious mystic Russian philosophy, old tsarist conceptions of the historic science of the mother country, unwillingness to see the post-revolutionary stratification of the peasantry and the revolutionary role of the working class.

In the class struggle in the countryside, for instance, here not infrequently protrude "rural" commissars who "shot at the back of middle peasants". In the vast country awakened by the revolution there were, of course, all sorts of commissars. However, the basic

fairway of our life was defined all the same by those commissars who were shot. It was namely they from whose backs stars were cut out, and who were burnt alive. It was necessary to pay the "attacking class" not only with the lives of commissars, Cheka members, rural Bolsheviks, members of the committees of poor peasants, the "participants in the movement of twenty thousand", but also of the first tractor operators, rural correspondents, girl-teachers, rural members of the Komsomol, and with the lives of tens of thousands of other unknown fighters for socialism.

The complication of the education of the young people is still redoubled by the fact that informal organizations and societies are springing up along the channel of the ideas of the "neo-liberals" and "neo-Slavophiles". Sometimes it so happens that in their leadership the extremist elements inclined to provocations got the upper hand. Recently politicization of these amateur organizations formed on the basis of pluralism, which is far from being socialist, has been shown. Not infrequently the leaders of these organizations say about the "division of power" on the basis of "parliamentary regime", "free trade unions", "autonomous publishing house" and the like. All this, in my opinion, allows one to make the conclusion that the main and cardinal question of the discussions now being held in the country is the problem–to recognize or not to recognize the leading role of the party and the working class in socialist construction, that is, in perestroika. It goes without saying, with all the ensuing theoretical and practical conclusions for policy, economy and ideology.

Derivative from this key problem of socio-historical world outlook is the problem of the role of socialist ideology in the spiritual development of Soviet society. To add one thing, this problem was sharpened as long ago as the end of 1917 by K. Kautsky who declared in one of his pamphlets, dedicated to October, that socialism distinguishes itself by iron-like planned character and discipline in economy and by anarchy in ideology and in spiritual life. This called forth rejoicing from Mensheviks, socialist-revoutionaries and other petty-bourgeois ideologists, but found resolute rebuff in Lenin and his companions, who consistently defended, as they said at that time, the "commanding heights" of scientific-proletarian ideology.

Let us remember: when V.I. Lenin collided with the manipulations of sociologist Pitirim Sorokin, popular at that time for the statistics of divorces among the Petrograd inhabitants, and with religion-protective writings of professor Vipper (which, by the way, looked absolutely naive in comparison with what is now being published in our country), then he, explaining the appearance of their works by the inexperience of the then workers in the mass information means, ascertained that the "working class in Russia succeeded in winning power, but did not yet learn to make use of it." In an opposite case, Vladimir Ilych pointed out, the revolutionary proletariat would "politely send" out of the country these professors and writers who "did not fit for the education of the masses as notorious

degenerates do not for the role of supperintendent for junior students at the educational institutions". By the way, out of the 164 people who were expelled at the end of 1922 according to the list of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, many came back afterwards and honestly served their people; professor Vipper is among them.

Like this, today the question of the role and place of socialist ideology has assumed an extremely sharp form. The authors of time-serving articles soften down the edges and criteria of scientific ideology on the plea of moral and spiritual "purification", and, manipulating glasnost, spread non-socialist pluralism, which objectively impedes perestroika in social consciousness. This especially affects the young people badly, which, I repeat, is distinctly felt by us, instructors of higher educational institutions, teachers of schools and all those who are engaged in youth problems. M.S. Gorbachev said at the February Plenary Meeting of the CC of the CPSU, "We should in the spiritual sphere, too, maybe, namely here in the first place, act, guided by our Marxist-Leninist principles. Comrades, we should not give up principles under any pretexts."

We stand and will stand on this. Principles have not been given to us, but have been gained by us through much suffering at the stern turning-points of the history of the fatherland.****

Soviet Russia,
March 13, 1988, p. 2

---

* In their article "What Do We Want to See in the Mirror of the Revolution?" doctors of historic science V. Gorbunov and V. Zhuravlev wrote that in the play of Mikhail Shatrov *Farther, Farther and Farther!* dedicated to the party of Lenin, "The historic role of this party as the leading force of the revolution in the building of socialism is not shown.... There are individual figures of the party, but the only thing they do is that they commit mistakes, quarrel among themselves, intrigue against each other, and accuse each other. All the positive activity of the vanguard of the working people who ensured the world-historic victory of the October Revolution and on the fronts of the civil war, built socialism and defended it in an unparalleled way in the Great Patriotic War, and then revived the country on the ruins and ashes, slipped out of the field of the author's vision.

"Shatrov insists," the reviewers emphasize, "as if Stalin like a demon, succeeded in resisting the natural laws and the requirements of socialist construction, in turning away the country from the main historic course, in degenerating the country, as a result of which the voice of the revolution becomes pressed down or barely audible. It is difficult to agree with such an interpretation of the basic laws of social development." (*Soviet Russia*, January 28, 1988.)

In their publication *Only Truth Is Not under Jurisdiction* historians-professors G. Gerasimenko, O. Obichkin and B. Popov note that in the dramatic composition of Mikhail Shatrov "the whole course of the construction of socialism in our country is represented as cabinet argument in extremely confused historic context where there are no enemies, no allies, no Rightists and no ones who are guilty; there are the accused Bolsheviks and their judges–the White generals, Mensheviks and the socialist-revolutionaries". "Consciously mixing up the chronological logic, in order to penetrate into the essence of the events of 70-year remoteness, the author does not notice that in this confusion into the artistic tissue of the play penetrates unhistoric character which is vividly manifested in the attempt to put the appraisal of what is happening

now into the mouth of V.I. Lenin. (*Pravda*, February 15, 1988.)

** In their letter "Along a New Circle" K. Lavrov, M. Ulyanov, G. Tovstonogov, M. Zakharov, A. Goncharov, V. Rozov, A. Gelyman and O. Yefremov wrote: "Indeed, our country has achieved perestroika and glasnost through much suffering. Therefore, any attempts to turn the process back, no matter with how lofty slogans they cover themselves, give rise to profound anxiety. The critical campaign concerning M. Shatrov's new play *Farther, Farther and Farther!* called forth namely such anxiety from us. Unlike some historians we think that in an artistic work Lenin appearing there not only can but also must appraise the present socialism and everything we are now doing." (*Pravda*, February 29, 1988.)

The editorial article summing up the discussion states: "*Pravda* not only considers it necessary to have a careful and most respectful attitude toward the creative work of the intelligentsia in the field of art, but also maintains the right of the Soviet community to give their view regarding it publicly." (*Ibid.*)

*** The order No. 227 of the People's Commissar of Defence of the USSR dated July 28, 1942 is published in the Soviet press since August 1988. It notes as follows, in particular: "The enemy is throwing more and more new forces into the front and, regardless of his great losses, moves forward, breaks deep into the Soviet Union, seizes new regions, devastates and destroys our towns and villages, rapes women and plunders and kills Soviet inhabitants.

"Don't move even a step backward! Now this should be our main slogan. We should stubbornly defend each position and each metre of the Soviet territory until our last drop of blood, cling to each patch of the Soviet land and defend it till the last possibility. Our motherland is going through hard days. We should stop the enemy, and then throw him back and rout him at whatever costs. Germans are not so strong as it seems to the panic-mongers. They are straining their last strength. If we endure their thrust now, in the near several months we will win the victory".

And, as is generally known, such a victory was won in Stalingrad.

**** The article called forth diverse reaction in the society and in the CPSU. V. Legostayev, former responsible worker of the Party Central Committee, writes that A.N. Yakovlev who was then visiting Mongolia "decided on the spot to hand in an application for his resignation to the General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU". Speaking at the secretariat of the Party Central Committee on March 15, E.K. Ligachev said that "on Sunday the *Soviet Russia* published an interesting article of Andreyeva from Leningrad. The material is not accidental. I request the comrades of editors-in-chief to pay attention to it." On March 23 and 24 the Political Bureau, at Gorbachev's request, "dealt with Nina Andreyeva, putting aside state affairs.... In the end the General Secretary got each of the participants at the conference to refuse to acknowledge, in some way or other, the propositions of the article of N.A. Andreyeva who was not known to any one of them.... The article entitled 'The Principles of Perestroika: the Revolutionary Character of Thought and Action' which was prepared by A.N. Yakovlev for *Pravda*, was published on April 5, 1988". (Newspaper *Day*, No. 16, August 1991, p. 3.)

In this article, which was called an editorial later on, no mention was made of the names either of Andreyeva who was criticized, or of Yakovlev, the author-critic, Secretary of the CC of the CPSU. This critical ideological document of the CPSU, which was so splendidly prepared, noted that the article "I Cannot Give Up Principles" raised "serious problems even in such a key point which cannot be called other than the ideological platform and manifesto of anti-perestroika force.... Perhaps, in this 'Letter to the Editorial Board' the readers have seen for the first time and in such a concentrated form, not search, not meditation and not even simply the expression of embarrassment and turmoil before complicated and acute problems which are raised in life, but the nonacceptance of the idea of renovation itself, and rigid account of an extremely definite position which is essentially conservative and dogmatic. As a matter of fact, two main theses run through the whole content of this position: one is for what all this perestroika is needed and the other is whether we have not gone too far in the matters of democratization and glasnost. The article calls upon us to make corrections and amendments in the matters of perestroika; it says that otherwise the 'power' allegedly will have to save socialism....

"The author applies to Churchill for support of his conception. I would like to

note that the eulogy on Stalin cited in the article does not belong to Churchill by any means. Something similar was said by I. Doicher, a well-known English Trotskyite. However, in any case naturally the question arises: Is it tactful to apply to bourgeois sources unscrupulously in the appraisal of the leaders, the prominent figures of our party and state?"

In the transport of inspiration by pluralism, the Secretary of the CC of the CPSU not only irresponsibly substituted Doicher for Churchill, but also distorted the only quotation from the article of Andreyeva who was being criticized, the quotation which was adduced by him in his "document of the CC of the CPSU."

* * *

A LETTER TO WRITER A.N. RYBAKOV*

Dear Anatoly Naumovich,

At the request of the editorial board of *Soviet Russia*, I have the honour to answer to your question concerning my article-letter "I Cannot Give Up Principles," of which, quite unexpectedly for me, so thorough textual analysis has been made and which has called forth an extremely enthusiastic reaction. I dare to hope that you will be lenient to my nonprofessionalism, taking into consideration that I am not a literary scholar or a critic, but only a reader, by the way, even an admirer of your first book in which I was absorbed in my youth like many others of my age. First of all, I should like to speak about the novel *Children of Arbat* in which, in my opinion, there are "individual topics borrowed from emigrant publications".

1. The topic concerning the fact that at the beginning of the 30s England, France and Japan were hostile to the USSR, but Germany was not regarded by Stalin as a potential enemy (preparations had not been made for a war against her), is contained in all *Bulletins of the Opposition* published by Trotsky in the USA in the years 1932-1935.

2. The assertion that Stalin had special archives in which he kept documents compromising the honour of Voroshilov, Yagoda, Kalinin and other leaders, belongs to Trotsky (*Bulletins of the Opposition*, 1939, No. 73). This very fact found reflection in the book of D. Robert *The Conscience of the Revolution and the Communist Opposition in Soviet Russia* (England, 1960) and in the book of S. Koen *Political Biography of Bukharin* (USA, published in 1973 and 1980), in the *Notes of Trotsky* (USA, 1970) and in others.

3. The characteristics of the personal qualities of the members of the Central Committee of the All-Union Bolshevik Communist Party in the 30s are close to or coincide with the characteristics of Trotsky given in his book *My Life* and in the articles of *Bulletins of the Opposition*. They were repeated with different extents of precision in the above-mentioned books of D. Robert, S. Koen, and also in the book of B. Suvarin *Stalin* and in the *History of the Soviet Union* of D. Boff. The former were the original source of the appraisal of Stalin as an "outstanding mediocrity of the party", the

qualification of Kirov as an "idiot" and a "half-taught person" and so on.

4. The interpretation of the murder of Kirov conforms to the exposition of Trotsky given originally in the article "Bureaucracy and Stalin" (*Bulletins of the Opposition*, January-February 1935). Later, in 1939, Trotsky altered this version and accused Yagoda, Japorozets and the then other leaders of the People's Commissariat in Charge of Internal Affairs of the murder. These pieces of information about the original sources of the indicated versions are contained in the lectures and articles of A.A. Kirilina, senior researcher of the Institute of History of the Party directly under the Leningrad Regional Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

5. The topic of Kirov, as Stalin's rival, is expounded not only in the above-indicated article of Trotsky and in the above-mentioned book of Suvarin but also in the books of Roy Medvedev *To the Trial of History. The Genesis and Aftereffect of Stalinism* (USA, 1974) and of I. Doicher *Biography of Trotsky* and in other books.

It would also be possible to say about other topics coinciding with foreign sources, but critic D. Urnov had done this until the publication of my letter, asserting, in particular, that in the "*Children of Arbat* the characteristic of Stalin is given in Trotsky's way, sometimes even with textual coincidences" (*Literary Newspaper*, January 27, 1988, No. 4. p. 3). Referring to confirmation of similar appraisals in the publications after March 13, 1988 is not needed.

In the autumn of last year, during the discussion of the works on the theme of our recent historic past on a TV programme, one of the participants said that at a meeting with Moscow readers you had not denied the use of foreign sources. Probably, the said participant of this discussion and the televiewers, including me, misunderstood something. Therefore, I beg your pardon for this mistake which, obviously, has to do with my lack of understanding of the peculiarities of literary creation and with the application in it of the rule and traditions of scientific creation where it is customary to call borrowing without references to sources plagiarism with all ensuing consequences.

I wish you fresh successes in your selected pursuits.

Nina Andreyeva

---

* In May 1988 A.N. Rybakov informed the *Soviet Russia* that he would bring an action against its editorial board "for slander", allegedly contained in the letter of Nina Andreyeva, "I Cannot Give Up Principles", which was sent to it. The editorial board informed the author of the letter of this, suggesting to clarify her position and answer the writer. After Rybakov received Andreyeva's letter, the question of court examination was dismissed by him.

* * *

OPEN LETTER TO THE 19TH ALL-UNION PARTY CONFERENCE*

On March 13 this year in the newspaper *Soviet Russia* was published my letter "I Cannot Give Up Principles", for which in the editorial article of *Pravda* dated April 5 "The Principles of Perestroika, the Revolutionary Character of Thought and Action" I was declared a creator of "ideological platform and manifesto of anti-perestroika forces", a "blind, diehard, undoubted dogmatist", a "conservative" and was rewarded with other lush labels of similar kind. All this is only due to that, within the limits of my knowledge and ability, I tried to interpret the significance for perestroika of such universally recognized principles of Marxism-Leninism as the concreteness of historic approach, incompatible with the interpretation of history as politics frustrated in the past, the class principle of the appreciation of social phenomena and such principles as the dialectical unity of the national and international, that of the class and the whole human and the leading role of the party and the working class in the remoulding of society. I am convinced that refusal of these principles or including them in the category of "dogmas" and "stereotypes" may only serve as withdrawal from Marxism-Leninism as the theoretical basis of the world historic mission of the proletariat.

It seems that only on the foundation of these and other basic principles of Marxism-Leninism can we say of presently so indispensable ideological and political consolidation of society, without which it is difficult to strengthen the continuity of the generations, awareness of national defence, patriotic consciousness, moral and political unity and genuine friendship of the peoples at all stages of perestroika and of social and economic development of socialism. In the appraisal of the uncommon revolutionary past of the country I proceeded and proceed from it that in everything dramatic and tragic the Soviet peoples under the leadership of the party, founded and fostered by V.I. Lenin, accomplished a world historic exploit, making a breach in the world system of imperialism, built a society free from exploitation and oppression, glorified their worker-peasant motherland, and defended it from the frantic attacks of the external and internal enemies. And nobody can take away from us what we have won at the cost of our blood and push us away from our chosen path.

The development of the events in the ideological life of our country during the past three months confirmed in full all the apprehensions, and I must thank *Pravda* which helped many people to understand better and know clearly that, under the conditions of the expansion of democracy and glasnost, in our country there clearly appeared groups, the social requirements of which obviously disagree with the fundamental interests of the working class and wide sections of the working people, and also with perestroika, no matter how much they extol it in words. My opinion is now shared by more than 1,500 authors of the letters sent to me, to the institute, which make up over 85 per cent of all the responses personally received by

me. They not only support my conclusions and appraisals, but also substantiate them with the facts of their personal and family biographies, with the evidences of the participants in and eyewitnesses of events, with the references to authoritative sources, to which it is now not accepted to refer in our press. Out of the about 200 authors of the responses who reject the principles and appraisals mentioned by me, the greater part is the relatives of the dispossessed kulaks, of those subjected to repression and those exposed to persecution, who were ridden by insurmountable social offences. Humanly their position is understandable, but it is necessary to emphasize that a far greater number of the suffered supports my views. The others, who aggressively accepted my publication in *Soviet Russia*, judging by their responses, belong to the resentful nationalists, mainly Zionists, or to people who flatly rejected socialism in the past, at present and in the future. Their principal "arguments" are the "texture" borrowed from those "superintendents of spirit" whose publications, according to the expression of M.S. Gorbachev, "instigate us to another path".

Unfortunately, inconsistency and diffusiveness of the interpretations of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, repeatedly confirmed by the historic experience of the countries of the socialist community, characterize the theses of the CPSU CC for the 19th All-Union Party Conference. And what is more, in my opinion, in this document there are certain retreats from the Programme of the CPSU and the resolutions of the 27th Congress of the party, of which nothing is mentioned nor argued in the text. I will only dwell on some of them, which seem to me most important.

First of all, in the theses there was no fixation of the communist perspective of the country. Our party is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and by no means the party of perestroika of the Soviet Union. I think that we cannot follow the lead of the conceptions of Bernstein and his revisionist followers which were reflected in the formula "Aim is nothing, movement is everything". It is known that V.I. Lenin invariably demanded that, in the solution of any problems of the revolutionary transformation of society, one should always see the single general aim–communism. Here he regarded communism not only as a distant final goal, as the whole historic and class landmark in the creative activity of the working people, but also as the criterion of the resolution by the communists of moral, ideological and cultural tasks. In other words, only what serves the communist perspective of the country is acceptable and useful.

The theses pointed out the "revolutionary character of creation", the "ideological renovation", and the "education in the civic qualities of personality", but there was not a single word about the need of communist education for all classes and all the strata of society in the course of the struggle against petty-bourgeois and bourgeois ideologies. However, namely here is the essence of the class-party approach to the solution of the problem of the ideological and educational work of the party. Lately the press organs started to attach primary importance to the "real pluralism of opinions", which reflects the presence of socio-political split of society in the course of perestroika and is shown, for instance, in the preachings to organize "alternative parties" with respect to the CPSU. Paradoxical as it is, members of the CPSU often appear as advocates of the "multiparty system of the political regime of the USSR". I think that it will be more correct to raise a question on the variety and multicolour of the views on the single platform of the like-minded persons–communists, but not to use the term "pluralism" soiled with the fingers of the revisionists. V.I. Lenin was always for the unity in the variety of ideas and opinions, which alone can ensure the success of mass political activities.

As Mechislav Kvasnetsky (Poland) writes to me, unceasing violations of the unity in the Polish United Workers' Party under the conditions of attacks from its enemies led to that in Poland in 1988 "only traces of socialism" remained. This allowed Professor P. Bozhik, former adviser to E. Gerek, to raise in the press the problem of dividing the Polish United Workers' Party into the Socialist Party of Equality and the Socialist Liberal Party. Of course, such a course of events may not only threaten the Polish working people, who have been led away from the socialist path by the revisionists and opportunists, with numerous misfortunes, but also may become the base for undermining the military-strategic positions of the countries under the Warsaw Treaty, in other words, the common conditions in our joint struggle for peace and for the security of the peoples.

The theses has neither mentioned the principal aspects of the present international working-class and communist movement nor taken into consideration the rightist danger of the opportunist attacks on the world revolutionary process, which has so far been led by our country and the CPSU.

I think it is a serious and fundamental defect that the theses has presented the social structure of our society in a one-sided way and incompletely. During the stagnant period there appeared millionaires in our country who, according to press information, number tens of thousands. Knitted together with the bribed bureaucrats, they already compose a special social stratum which differs by its own interests, requirements, psychology, morale and ideology. The representatives of bourgeois liberalism, whose influence is increasing in our days, objectively supply them with their ideology. In the course of perestroika the Soviet millionaires consolidate their positions in society, legalize the bourgeois way of life, stimulate deideologization, demoralization and deaesthetization of social consciousness and culture, rouse nationalistic passions, join in cooperative activity, not infrequently serving them through the legalization of unjustly gained sums, create cult of gain, try to reduce the tax percentage in the law on inheritance, instigate, through their theoreticians, the cre-

ation of "democratic unions", "popular fronts", which claim to play the role of political parties, declare the "question of power" to be the fundamental problem of perestroika, give advice from whom it should be "taken away" and to whom it should be "given". Spokesmen for bourgeois liberalism noisily claim for the dissolution of the CPSU in the people and in various mass organizations. In one of the letters sent to me, for instance, they urge students to the "freedom of the sex", to the fight for the opening of houses of prostitution (firstly in Moscow and Leningrad), for the permission of free exit from the country to go to Israel and capitalist countries, to refusal of military service, to resignation from the Komsomol, and so on.

It is paradoxical, but there are members of the CPSU among the millionaires. In this connection, along with the question of sociopolitical certification of the members of the party, I suggest the introduction of the system of the maximum amount of income for party members which may prevent the party ranks from getting stained. In its time its introduction, side by side with the purge of party members, played a positive role in the party of Bolsheviks in curbing the desire of people from the party leadership for personal enrichment for one thing. It is known that the emoluments for the published reports, speeches, articles and selected works of Stalin, Kalinin, Kirov, Molotov and other leaders went into the party cash. Stalin prizes were paid from Stalin's emoluments, but from the end of the 50s they started to be financed from the treasury funds. Of course, the maximum amount of income for party members should be sufficiently great, so as not to hold in check the realization of material incentive in labour, but should be reasonably limited, so as to prevent those in the CPSU from turning into millionaires who have their own model of "communism".

For the millionaires and parvenus, who prosper on the wave of the boom of the employees of cooperatives, the problem of the rise in the prices of basic products of foodstuff is not vital. But it is a different thing for the wide sections of the working people whose standard of living has been continually falling in recent years. Therefore, it is necessary to confirm and carry out the resolutions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU on the raising of the purchasing power of rouble, which is impossible under the constant rise in prices. So, it is pointless to examine the question of the "reconsideration of the retail prices" at the party conference until public discussion of this problem.

The mass media, and before anything else, such press organs as *Light, Soviet Culture, Moscow News, New World* and some others, not always distinguish the difference between the opportunist and anti-party attacks, revisionist, supra-class views, on one hand, and the just criticism, well-founded anxiety of the communists and non-party people in connection with the accumulated lapses of our society, on the other hand. Hence, the class aspects of the ideological

struggle and educational work are weakened and kept in the background. The strategic course of modern revisionism, the aim of which is "not the destruction of communism, but its reorganization", is consigned to oblivion and the sad experience of the counterrevolutionary rebellion in Hungary in 1956 and of the creeping counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia in 1968 is not taken into consideration.

More than a century ago K. Marx warned that compromise with Lassalleites and other petty-bourgeois elements is accompanied by the compromise with the "whole band of immature students and over-wise doctors, who set themselves the task of giving socialism a 'higher, ideal' direction, that is, of replacing its materialist base (which requires, before being operated on, serious objective study) with modern mythology, with its goddesses of justice, freedom, equality and brotherhood" (Vol. 34, p. 234). Have not the "superintendents of spirit" appeared in our mass media who naively and arrogantly proclaim non-class "freedom", "liberalization" and "democracy"? Are they not using now the "struggle" against stagnation and dogmatism for attacks on socialism, on its history, theory and practice, trying to appropriate a supreme role of the autonomous and irresponsible interpreters of the policy of the CPSU, of its programme and its basic decisions? Have they not in our days camouflaged the antagonisms between the socialist and nonsocialist elements as if it were the struggle between the supporters and opponents of perestroika?

What is particularly dangerous today is, in my opinion, the numerous attempts to use the criticism of cult of personality, of dogmatism and conservatism with the aim of undermining the trust of the Soviet people in the party, in Leninism and in the path traversed by the country. A clear example of this lately is the article of V. Selyunin "Sources", published in the May issue of *New World*. The author of this publication and his sympathisers have turned the theory of scientific socialism and the basic ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin into the object of attacks on the part of "intellectuals", scholars and literary men, who proclaim the opposition of science to ideology, of theory to politics, and of art to the leadership given to it by the party and state. In our journalism democracy and glasnost are often regarded not as a method or means for the solution of the problems of the development of socialist society, but as a prior and independent aim of perestroika.

In particular, a lot of arguments are going on about the limitation of the period during which communists work at the elected party posts, starting from the district party committee to the CPSU CC. It seems that the main problem here lies not in how many times a communist can be elected to the party committee in succession, but in how creatively, purposefully, competently and in principled manner the elected can, in the elective organ, accomplish the tasks set by the party. The proposals for separately selecting the staff of the party committees and secretaries at the meetings, conferences and con-

gresses cannot but make one guarded. Such order, seeming democratic, since the secretary is elected individually at a broader forum, in essence, makes the "first persons" actually not accountable at the committees, possessing a special status, which will objectively restrict the collective nature of the work of the elective organs, in other words, inner-party democracy. In order to relieve the high-handed and corrupted secretary of a district party committee, for instance, it will be necessary to convene a party conference, which has elected him to this post, not merely as a member of the district party committee. For the re-election of the General Secretary in such a case it will be needed to open not a plenum of the CPSU CC, but an extraordinary party congress, the convocation of which he will hardly favour.

After the publication of the editorial article in *Pravda* dated April 5, there started a general "exposure" of my "anti-perestroika activity". The clamorous crowd of the "superintendents of spirit" who have recognized themselves and been greatly "offended", are conducting for four months public "explanatory" measures throughout the country, demanding that the delegates to the conference should express "which platform they support, the platform of Gorbachev or that of Nina Andreyeva. They are organizing "round-table talks", requesting to exclude me from the party and dismiss me from office. All the mass media and the "best brains" have been set in motion for this. Vile insults and threats of physical reprisal are continually poured through the telephone, mythical compromise and the "opposition to perestroika" which is non-existent in Leningrad, and in the institute where I am working, are artificially hunted out, and excellent labels attached to me are increasing. How do such phenomena conform to socialist glasnost and Soviet democracy? What does this cliquish moral-political strip tease testify to?

The editorial staff of *Pravda* keeps silent to the request to publish my answers to the criticism carried in its editorial and other articles. They neither publish the hundreds of the letters of the readers who share my position and have sent me the copies of the letters they sent to *Pravda,* as well as the responses of the comrades from the German Democratic Republic and Poland. This still more gives rise to bewilderment so that a number of our and foreign newspapers have doubted my authorship of the letter "I Cannot Give Up Principles" and no one has refuted these inventions which are connected with accusing me of plagiarism.

I would like to request the 19th All-Union Party Conference to examine, from the party viewpoint, the questions raised in my letter to the *Soviet Russia,* as well as in this appeal, and also give an objective political appraisal of the prevailing situation.

June 10, 1988
Leningrad
N.A. Andreyeva

* The letter sent to the 19th All-Union Party Conference is published for the first time although N.A. Andreyeva has sent its copies to *Pravda* and other central party newspapers. At the Party Conference M.S. Gorbachev, concerning this letter, declared in his remark with regard to M.A. Ulyanov's speech: "Mikhail Alexandrovich, she has sent a letter. It has just now reached us here. They have given it to us. The members of the presidium will read the letter. She stands her ground." (*Pravda*, June 30, 1988, P. 7.) Andreyeva did not receive an answer to her letter.

* * *

OPEN LETTER TO M.A. ULYANOV

I saw you on the rostrum of the All-Union Party Conference on the TV screen, and read your speech * in *Pravda.* All of you who were "taken by surprise", "stunned", and "frightened", those "who stood stock-still and waited designs", "trembled, but patiently, obediently and fatally waited" the pointed finger of the "poor chemist-alchemist", you who are incapable of making out "who is White, and who is Red", seemed to me very pitiful. Of course, such fright is understandable for those who earnestly and hastily squeeze out tears, drop by drop, from themselves, bondsmen. But how is it that you, a well-known and seemly talented actor, who embodied on the screen the unforgettable images of the heroic representatives of your country, are embarrassed!? It seems to me that playing the role of the hero on the screen signifies being a hero in life even a little. As is seen, heroism on the stage and animal fear in life are for some people things which are quite compatible with one another.

If someone suddenly publishes again something "bitter and terrible", in that case, proceeding from the undesirability of similar stresses for your health henceforth, I would not object to personal talk with you on the banks of the Neva to discuss that which has so amazed you. Of course, without "standing at attention" and the "damned fear which sits in our genes".**

July 3, 1988
Leningrad

Nina Andreyeva
Moscow News, No. 33,
August 14, 1988

* Speaking at the 19th All-Union Party Conference M.A. Ulyanov, Chairman of the Board of the Union of Theatrical Workers of the RSFSR and People's Artist of the USSR, asserted: "The article of Nina Andreyeva took us by surprise. Many, not all, but many stood at attention and waited for the following orders.... But it was not she with whom the matter was, but we, for we got surprized by her letter. We were terrified (*Applause*)..... Although they had a headache, the overwhelming majority waited for predestination with their hearts sinking. And they understood that it was not true, but they waited, trembled, waited obediently and with the feeling that they were doomed.... This article stunned us for a while.... Let us examine now: who is "White", and who is "Red" (*Applause*). (*Izvestia*, June 30, 1988.)

** In his TV interview M. Ulyanov, Hero of Socialist Labour, refused to meet N. Andreyeva, but he did not enter into the polemics any more.

* * *

The more the article "I Cannot Give Up Principles" was attacked, the greater number of letters of encouragement the author of the article received from the Soviet people who were anxious about the situation in the country. Thousands of letters were sent to the institute from workers, kolkhoz farmers, scientists, soldiers, party workers and journalists, students and pensioners. Many of the authors of these letters did not write down their addresses, for fear of persecution. The demand for a collective meeting of like-minded people to create a socio-political organization for defending socialism, became gradually crystallized in the majority of the letters.

The suggestion for setting up the society was supported by a number of the workers of the Leningrad Regional Committee of the CPSU in Smolny, who helped to multiply the materials and introduced the party's information on the state of affairs in the country and in the international arena. It was planned to convene the inaugural conference in Leningrad in February 1989, the suggestion to name the All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" was adopted, and its Rules and Regulations were worked out. However, at the last moment the party bureaucrats in Smolny changed their minds and the inaugural conference had to be convened in the capital, overcoming a great deal of organizational difficulties.

The inaugural conference took place in Moscow from May 18 to 20, 1989, and there the All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" was set up and its Rules and Regulations were adopted. In the conference a coordination council was elected and the basic directions of its work were outlined. N.A. Andreyeva was elected the chairwoman of the coordination council, which later came to be named the political executive committee.

The Rules of the Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" note: "The Society 'Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals' is a voluntary union of the people who are loyal to the socialist fatherland. The society sets it as its principal aim to rally the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and working intellectuals and all the rest of the Soviet people in the struggle for socialism and communist prospects of the country, to preserve and consolidate the state integrity of the USSR and protect the fundamental interests of the working people. In its activity the 'Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals' is guided by Marxism-Leninism and by the class point of view in the appraisal of the reality, and follows the traditions of Bolshevism."

At the inaugural conference N.A. Andreyeva delivered the report, *Some Characteristics of the Crisis and the Tasks of the Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals"*.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CRISIS AND THE TASKS OF THE SOCIETY "UNITY"

Speech Delivered at the Inaugural Conference of the All-Union Society "Unity" May 18, 1989, Moscow

The most pressing of problems today exists in our society. Can we be satisfied with the direction and results of perestroika, economic and political reforms? There are various solutions to the problems, but the various opinions about them conflict with one another. So, allow me to express my point of view.

For four years after the victory of the October Revolution our country fought to defeat the White Guards and foreign aggressors, and four years was again needed for the Soviet people to rout German fascism and Japanese militarism. A similar period was also needed to restore the war-destroyed economy and return to the pre-war level of industrial production. Now for four years we have been misled by perestroika, which is undermining not only the international prestige of our country but also the people's belief in the creative possibilities of socialism. The economic, political and ideological crisis, the most acute crisis in the history of our country, demands that we adopt immediate and drastic measures. What, then, is the main aspect of this crisis?

First of all, it was not born today. The origin of the crisis dates back to the period of stagnation following the reign of Stalin. Its root cause lies, in essence, in the economic reform conducted from the 1960s to the 1980s. Herein lies the cause of the practical failure of all the economic reorganization perestroika embraced, an opinion shared by many people.

As is known, the effectiveness of the activities of an enterprise is determined by increase in its income. The more the income, the more highly the activities of an enterprise are appreciated. An increase in income can be ensured in two different ways. The first is to improve the technical basis and economize in the use of raw materials and resources, in other words, to increase labour productivity and reduce the cost of products; the second is to make profits by means of pricing goods at an abnormally high level, which can be done by manipulation. The price of a cup, for example, can be raised two or three times by printing a cheap flower on it. And if this is done, the plan is considered fulfilled and bonuses are paid.

In the period of Stalin, the first stage of our history, the basis of cost-accounting management was a systematic cut in the cost of products and in the price of goods. After the period of Stalin, the basic index of cost-accounting management was profit, which resulted in the disappearance of cheap articles and foodstuffs and a rise in the price of goods and services. The present economic reforms which are tied to perestroika have finally legalized the second way, eliminating the inconsistencies of the Khrushchev-Brezhnev reforms and making profit-making the sole purpose of the economic productive activities. That is, "All that is possible is not forbidden!"

Here I must note that not all economists share the views of the advocates and patrons of so-called radical economic reform, the active supporters of which are Abalkin, Zaslavskaya, Agangebyan, Bunich, G. Popov, Latsis and other economists who boast of its

"high practicability" and its ability to cope with political situations. They are also called the "market economists" and "commodity economists". At present they have complete freedom to conduct their activities; they occupy all the key posts in the economic and planning organs and have their representatives (V.A. Medvedev) in the Politburo. The supporters of the opposite view, Deryabin, Eremin, Efremov, Yakushev, M. Popov and others, are not allowed to express their views in publications, and are slighted and ignored, despite the supposed freedom of expression. They assert that the index of profit in cost-accounting management must be replaced with a decrease in costs and, accordingly, in the prices of products. They are particularly opposed to the abnormally high price of nutritious foodstuffs. Contrary to the market economists, they are called "planning economists" and "anti-commodity economists".

So what have the present economic reforms really brought us?

1. The bases for material production, which can be built only on the basis of modern engineering and technology, are lagging far behind and, consequently, our country shall fall far behind the developed capitalist states and is reduced to their appendage, producing raw materials for them. According to published data, no more than 10 per cent of the products of the machine-building complexes in 1988 conformed to world standards. If matters continue in this way, perestroika, which aims at taking our country to the level of the developed countries, will have to go on for 100 years.

2. The shady economy and the black market are growing. According to data from economists, the amount of money circulating in this market is 50 billion roubles.

3. The amount of unearned income is increasing in our country and exploitation is reviving. Using cooperatives as an excuse, many private, capitalist enterprises are employing hired labour and the private economy has been legalized.

4. The two basic forms of ownership under socialism, which had been fixed under a single state planning system for the management of the economy, are no longer dominant. The two forms of social ownership began to break up into many separate and self-governing enterprises and complexes which are quite independent of the state, into cooperatives that are free from the state, and into an economy of private entrepreneurs and tenants.

Their conversion into fully self-governing, cost-accounting, self-providing, self-financing and independent bodies fixing their own wage levels represents a multifarious economy without the socialist framework. This decentralization of social production and disintegration of state ownership are strangely described as the "restoration of Lenin's viewpoint on socialism."

5. The undermining of the state monopoly of exports (Bukharin advocated it in his day) and the individual entry of enterprises and cooperatives into foreign markets has resulted in the disappearance of necessary products from our country (mineral fertilizers, chemicals and television sets, for example), with the introduction of Western capital to exploit our natural, material, labour and intellectual resources, and with the growth of speculation and spontaneous emergence in the economy.

6. The deficit in the state budget (100 billion roubles in 1989) and the foreign debt of the state (more than 50 billion roubles) are increasing at an unprecedented rate. There has been a naive attempt to check this by means of a cut in expenditure on defence and capital construction.

7. The increase in the rate of inflation and the fall in the value of the rouble mean that the shops are empty; the living standards of the Soviet people are falling, and tens of millions of people are living below the poverty line. According to calculations made by economists, their number will be 100 million in the 1990s, among them 12 to 15 million being jobless. To our shame, all the pensioners and invalids who built and defended socialism with their bare hands find themselves below the poverty line. Everywhere is heard, "Things are worse!"

8. The number of legitimate home-bred millionaires, more than 130 thousand according to publications in early 1988, is increasing. An inadequate calculation shows that more than half of the deposits in banks belong to only 3 % of the depositors. The total amount of money circulated among Soviet millionaires exceeds 200 billion roubles. Infiltrating the Soviet economy as alien elements, they deform it, disorganize exchange, distribution and consumption in society, cause chaos and irresponsibility in commerce, and bring about the growth of corruption and law-breaking, becoming the source of bribing management apparatuses. On the basis of the interests of the home-bred "masters of life", the management and political structure of the anti-socialist forces, such as the "Democratic Union", "People's Front" and "Memorial" is expanding. The voices of their ideologists were particularly loud during the last election campaign.

9. The allowance of monopoly capital (American, Japanese and West German) into our country will not save the declining Soviet economy. The capitalists vie with one another to come to our country not to help us escape from our crisis, but to squeeze us, make huge profits in the USSR, exploit the Soviet people and rob our country of its natural resources.

10. Over the past four years the natural environment has been severely damaged with an increase in the number of ecological catastrophes. Decentralized, autonomous and closed enterprises and complexes, in their passionate pursuit of profit, do not pay due attention to protecting the natural environment from the harmful side effects of production. Profit-making at any cost leads to the criminal behaviour of causing ecological destruction, bringing great harm to the lives and health of the people.

We frequently come across in statements in publications the

claim that we have built "regimented", "state-capitalist" and "feudalistic" socialism which must, therefore, go over to "humanitarian", "humane" and "free" socialism and, to do so, that we must implement economic reforms. In fact, such reforms, as everyone can see clearly, mean the introduction of market-cooperative and shopkeepers' socialism, and the restoration of the free competition that existed in the period of the pre-monopoly, a transitional form for the re-establishment of capitalist power in our country. Poland and Hungary are running towards the abyss that lies ahead of us, and we are hastily pushing the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic to it, despite the lack of success.

In connection with the reform practice, we are not surprised at the removal of the communist future in our country where the slogan for survival has become: "Rescuing a drowning man is his own business." This indicates that we are, in fact, retreating from the social progress which is achieved through communist civilization.

The deterioration in the people's standard of living and the critical state of our society are reflected in serious social, ideological and moral problems and the disintegration of the moral and political unity and friendship among people. The gigantic increase in crime, armed robbery, drug addiction, prostitution, alcoholism, the embezzlement of state and private property and suicide is threatening the whole of society, and our country finds itself in the third rank in the world at present. All this has affected the economy, deepening the economic crisis. This is expressed particularly in the weakening of labour discipline, task-fulfilment and military and social discipline. Economic strikes are on the increase, and through them the working class is coming out against the economic reforms.

All sorts of anti-socialist elements in the disguise of the "supporters of perestroika" are creating social unrest. Hundreds of unexplained fires occur every day, tens of thousands of domestic animals perish, catastrophic traffic accidents are on the increase, foodstuffs are spoiled and ecological conditions in some cities are worsening. The neo-Trotskyites are making frantic efforts to drive a wedge between the young people and the older generation. The prestige of honest and productive labour is falling. The deformation of the socialist economy is one of the main causes of the strain in the relations between nations and of the creation of nationalism. The consequences are such tragic events as that in Tbilisi in April this year, and the centrifugal and separatist tendency in some republics is growing, to the extent of withdrawing from the USSR.

The development of the socialist method of production is guaranteed by the leading role of the working class and its communist party, which underwent severe examinations in the historical period of the Great Patriotic War. Today this leading role has become the main aim and target of violent attacks by the anti-socialist forces backed by the revisionists in the leadership of the party. They, in particular, have made use of the fact that the party was gradually

departing from the protection of the interests of all the working people including the working class after the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. The leading role has begun to be played by the swollen apparatus which had been, for decades, contaminated by the abuse of the party's authority, bureaucracy, careerism, opportunism, began to serve its own interests and lost contact with party members and other working people in a large measure.

The first attack on the leading role of the CPSU began in the field of history. The "white men" who were condemned by history were transformed into "black figures" after the October Revolution. Under the cloak of the "completeness of the truth" they evaluated unilaterally the civil war, the New Economic Policy, industrialization, collectivization, the cultural revolution and the Patriotic War. Irresponsible accusations are being directed against the shock-workers, the Stakhanovites, the Papaninists, the crew of the *Chelyuskin*, the hero pilots and the young guards. Pavlik Morozov, a boy who was slain by his grandfather, a kulak, is being labelled as a "turncoat", "informer" and "victim of Stalinism". Here I quote a verse from one of poet Victor Kochetov's poems:

The thirty years of victory and ordeal
We slighted as a waste.

The ideological enemy of socialism regards it as one of its principal tasks to "unmask the crimes" of the leaders of the CPSU (Bolsheviks) and the Soviet government. All sorts of accusations are being levelled against Zhdanov, Voroshilov, Molotov, Ordzhonikidze, Dzerzhinsky, Kirov, Kalinin and many others. In particular, they are endeavouring to "uncover the crimes" of J.V. Stalin in a violent, cunning and furious way. He is now represented to contemporary young readers and film and television viewers as an "agent of the tsarist guard", a "sadist", a "debauchee", an "anti-Semitist" and the "greatest criminal of all ages". The White Guards, Trotskyites, Vlasovites and their descendants and other anti-Soviet elements who were expelled from our country are inventing provocative lies and rumours and spreading slander on an unprecedented scale. And the "sons and daughters", "grandchildren", "second wives", "cousins" and "nephews" of the political figures who were once known as opportunists are hastening to play their part in the struggle against Stalinism.

In detracting from the true leaders who were active during the most crucial period after the October Revolution, the notorious slogan, the "completeness of truth", has restored the political reputation of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Pyatakov, Ryutin and others in opposition and raised them to the ranks of "faithful Leninists" and the "guards of Lenin's party". A political rehabilitation of the Judas Trotsky has been attempted. Steven Cowen, an American expert on the affairs of the Soviet Union, and Isaak Doicher, an activist in the

Trotskyist Fourth International, have appeared as political consultants on the history of our country. Ranged on their side are such pseudo-historians as Roy Medvedev, Antonov-Ovseenko and Yu. Afanasiev who have slandered the Soviet system so frantically that the veteran anti-Soviet elements were shocked. It is no surprise, under the circumstances, that the "Democratic Union" and the "National-Democratic Party of Latvia" planned to commemorate in March this year the founding of the "Latvian Volunteers' SS Legion", 50,000 men of which fought in cooperation with the Hitlerites and were killed in the armed struggle against "Stalinism".

It is obvious today that the vicious attack on Stalin is nothing but a screen to camouflage the attack on Lenin, the revolution, socialism and the great victory in the Patriotic War. I consider, in connection with this, that it is especially important to hold discussions for restoring the historical truth in publications. How can spitting at the past, bringing about a crisis at present and predicting a gloomy future be a source of and a driving force for social development and the implementation of the tasks of perestroika? While distorting history from the anti-communist point of view, the anti-socialist forces are attacking the so-called power of the party and the leading role of the working class. The CPSU, having been identified as a "bureaucratic apparatus" for the past two or three years, is now defined as a "Mafia", as is shown by the speeches in the debates on Leningrad TV which have lasted for three days. I consider that in recent elections the failure of many party leaders can be attributed to their positions in the party, not to their personality. The "Democratic Union" and the "People's Fronts" put forward anti-communist slogans and conducted the election campaign by using every kind of label and expression, as is done in Western-style elections. In only a few places did the party show its unity and influence.

A serious study of the general aim and target of the continuous criticism in the mass media clearly indicates that it is the past, present and future CPSU. It is a matter of great importance to free the party from its renegades and revisionists. Is it possible, however, to wash all the dirt off the party, as the saying goes, by throwing away even the baby with the bath water? No matter how fine the motive may be, demagogic criticism and nihilism will result in the weakening of the party which, as a united political force still, is capable of leading the masses of people along the road to socialism and progress. I think, at this point, that we must pay attention to the matter for which the anti-Soviet elements have long waited–anarchy and chaos. One of the aspects of the struggle against the home-bred anti-communist and revisionist elements is Lenin's principles for party building such as democratic centralism which is now considered outdated. It has become the fashion nowadays to support the opposition and factions. Many party workers have regrettably been caught in this trap. B. Yeltsin, who is popular with the citizens of Moscow, failed in his interview because of the defensive factions. It

has occurred to me that this position is a peculiar realization of the call of Ernst Fisher, one of the fathers of the contemporary renegades, who appealed to the intellectuals of the socialist countries to "break up the communist and state power from within and without". At present our intellectuals within and without the party are playing their part with no less success in this regard.

Whatever their subjective intentions may be, the propagandists of the multi-party idea are initially aiming at restricting the political leadership of the CPSU over society, next at turning it into a discussion club, and finally at removing its leadership. All this indicates an increase in the political instability in society and the deterioration of the authority of the leadership by the party and state. Although laws, ordinances and resolutions are adopted after time-consuming and useless discussion, they are withdrawn in most cases because they are not perfect and receive every manner of criticisms in the mass media. Now an uncertain and unsteady situation has been created and the disguised enemies of socialism are making good use of it to raise the stakes.

The adoption of the Election Law, in my point of view, was a step backwards in the development of Soviet democracy. General, direct and equal elections have not been implemented, although most of the deputies were elected on the principle of the alternative (in other words, voters elected a person. For example, we elected one out of 34 candidates whose photograph and programme were on display in all the voting districts of the country). One third of the people's deputies in the USSR have not been elected in a direct vote. One deputy, for example, had to collect 5 million votes, while another less than 600 votes. Groups of the elite–writers, artists and film directors–have been formed with the support of social organizations. Factories with several thousand employees which are well-known across the country do not have their own deputies, but the editorial board of the magazine *Neva* consisting of only 20 members has two deputies, D. Granin and B. Nikolski. As a result, the ratio of workers is less than 18 % and all the others are members of the elite in the present composition of the people's deputies of the USSR. The working people have to form their own "organizations" of fitters, turners, metal workers and miners. But however much effort the working class and the peasants make, they cannot protect themselves from having their rights infringed upon.

The new Election Law has permitted the anti-socialist forces to achieve their goals. Prior to the Soviet congress one of these forces organized a "powerful democratic minority" as they called it, (20 % of which consists of deputies) headed by Academician Sakharov. The aim of this minority is to change the present system and "transfer power from the Politburo to the Supreme Soviet", in which they calculate they have greater influence than in the Soviet congress. The Karyakin, Geliman and Nikolski groups have been given the chance of taking a high platform and are constantly undermining

socialism, destroying the functions of the Soviet government one by one, demanding a change to private ownership, a multi-party system and paid military service, and of discrediting the CPSU further until it is dissolved. Aiming their main blow at the party and its faithful cadres of Leninism, the renegades have schemed to defeat those who go against the views of the anti-Soviet elements in and outside the country. After that they will be able to promote Sakharov to President. This will, of course, be possible when their reactionary ambitions are achieved.

How can we define the socio-political indicators which determine the situation perestroika has created in our country? This is not only difficult, but also an extremely serious matter. I think that the anti-Soviet forces active in our country with the support of the revisionists have developed under perestroika and are responsible for events that are, in their class character, similar to those in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. The foundations exist for this. Learning from the experience of their unsuccessful predecessors, they are making good use of the historical necessity of perestroika and its slogans. Just as in the two countries mentioned, they found the ground for their initial attack on socialism in an excessive, purposeful and dramatic economic crisis and the inability of the party and the state to cope with it effectively. Anti-socialist and anti-Soviet groups are operating with their own political structures and with the support of the Western countries and revisionists. Today they are emphasizing the counter-revolutionary character of the situation, saying that "The bottom does not want to live in the old way, nor does the top." The supporters of pseudo perestroika (as in Hungary and the CSR) entrusted the role of a "shock force" to the young people and students who lacked experience in life and political training. It is no accident that they called for non-ideological education and provoked students to reject the study of Marxism and Leninism.

The starting point of the anti-socialist process was the congresses of writers in the CSR and in our country. Their "merit" was the fact that social demagogy was carried in most of the press. Having no mass foundation in the country, they directed their efforts to manipulating the conscience of society, deceiving the people, implanting the love for gain in them, creating uncertainty about the line taken in the October Revolution in 1917 and distracting people from fulfilling the tasks of socio-economic development for socialism, development into a society with a single economy managed by human reason, into a society of the humane distribution of the material wealth and into a society in which we will be able to rid ourselves of the commodity-financial boundaries imposed by means of the productive forces. Socialism is not a historical alternative but an indispensable stage for the development of humanity. Whoever blocks this path will have to bear responsibility before the people.

In consideration of the situation created in our country, I think it is necessary to adopt an extraordinary and urgent measure. The past does not return. History hates indolence. I consider that the convening of the 28th Extraordinary Congress of the CPSU is timely, and the consolidation of our ranks by wide discussion about it is necessary before its convening, and before all this, we must bid farewell to those who don't want to take the road of socialism with the people.

I think that the main task of our society is to help our country to escape from its serious crisis. It is necessary, today, to instil the idea, "Our socialist fatherland is facing danger!" into the minds of the working people. We must help the people to discard the illusion that everything will go well of its own accord. In the final analysis, the working people have the ultimate right to speak. We must make good use of all the possibilities of democracy existing under pseudo perestroika to reverse the anti-revolutionary process.

(Published for the first time)

* * *

The creation of the All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" and the organization of its committees in the cities, regions and republics again attract the attention of the means of mass information to Nina Andreyeva. Well-known newspapers of the USA, Britain, Spain, Italy and other countries publish her interview. Progressive Soviet journalists also strive not to lag behind their foreign colleagues; they publish her articles in patriotic magazines and collections of articles. The authority of the society "Unity" is growing.

WHO ARE YOU, NINA ANDREYEVA?

Answer to the Question Raised by Correspondent M. Belousov

Perhaps our correspondent has put this question a hundred times (in one or another form) to the person who is widely known but still not known to all, a person who wrote her first article for a newspaper in the fiftieth year of her life.

On March 13, 1988 Nina Alexandrovna Andreyeva awoke to be known to everyone who read this morning paper as a subscriber for Soviet Russia. *By midday the most reputable establishments hastily duplicated her article-letter* I Cannot Give Up Principles. *And in a few days almost one thousand newspapers of the Soviet Union reprinted it wholly.*

So, many people got to know about Nina Andreyeva. Or rather, not about herself, but about what she thinks–not a writer, not a minister, not a secretary of a regional party committee, but a master of science, an ordinary instructor of the Leningrad Technological Institute–what she thinks about our time and the lessons of the past, about perestroika and about the course along which perestroika is advancing.

At first I requested her to recall how her article came into being.

It has a long history, said she, approximately three years ago they proposed my husband, Vladimir Ivanovich, professor and head of the philosophical chair at our institute, to work in Afghanistan. He had already had experience: He went, for instance, to Czechoslovakia soon after the August event of 1968, coached Czech-postgraduates for the defence of theses, and delivered lectures at the local institute of Marxism-Leninism. He asked me to go to Afghanistan. I said "Let's go." And we started to prepare for that. At that time I took in everything that was connected with Afghanistan, as if I had accustomed myself to the new circumstances. And when I saw Alexandr Prokhanov's book *The Tree at the Centre of Kabul,* written in a sincere and masterly fashion, I read it to the end and remembered a lot from it. But we did not go to Afghanistan because the world situation had suddenly changed. However, after some time I read, all of a sudden, the talk with Prokhanov in the newspaper *Leningrad Worker* and I could not but respond to it. Such was what happened to me all the time: If something offended me, either an event or a commentary on it, I wanted to express my opinion about it, but not to be published, although I posted my comment to the editorial board. Once, for instance, a cordial, splendid answer came from *Pravda*. However, they did not publish my article–neither *Pravda* nor *Leningrad Pravda* to which I had also sent my responses. However, *Leningrad Worker* published a piece of my letter. On January 1, 1988, an article of Prokhanov himself was published there, and I again took up a pen. It was not published. However, both of my letters proved useful to me later on. Availing myself of the occasion, I sent my letters to *Soviet Russia, Pravda* and to *Soviet Culture*. This was to do with the fact that various articles had been published there, and my letters could serve as the continuation of the story. However, there was a phone call only from *Soviet Russia*. This was on February 23. Journalist Denisov made the call and said that the editorial staff was interested in my letters, and suggested that I join them in writing, some twenty pages, true, without the expression of my emotion concerning Prokhanov. I agreed. On March 6 there was another telephone call and we talked. However, after the holiday Denisov came to Leningrad and was occupied with my article for a whole day. He asked me to take away many quotations and names, and also the indication of primary sources. I was not opposed to it. A "more news-like" basis was required–Denisov began to write it himself....

–Namely this basis confused many inhabitants of Leningrad. You see, there it was talked about how you strolled with students along the Petergof Park and feasted your eyes upon the sculptures. Only a man who had never seen the Petergof Park in winter, could write so: At this time all the sculptures there are exhibited in small houses–"wooden boxes".

–I think that at that time many and many letters, which *Soviet Rus-*

sia received, would have been published. And there were really many of them. Denisov, who came to Leningrad, said about this when, at the House of Culture named after Karl Marx, there was discussion about my speech in March. I read the letters sent to me. I believe that different people, even those with contrary opinions, would have expressed their opinions. I think that it would have been the discussion which, as it seems to me, was keenly required for perestroika at that time in particular. I know exactly that my letters sent to *Soviet Russia, Pravda* and *Soviet Culture* were not the first ones. Many people had written before me. This is shown by the copies of these letters which were sent to me by their authors soon after the publication of my letter. So my article is a mere chance. True, I do not forget that a chance is a form of the manifestation of necessity....

Do you not want to say by this that the split of social consciousness, so to say, of feeling, psychological and ideological, had by that time so matured that any speech in the newspaper similar in the meaning could call forth such a reaction?....

The article carried in *Soviet Russia,* to my mind, compelled many people to disclose their essence before time, and I attach such significance to it. It compelled many people to say about what they did not want to speak, and made people show their cards. The split of social consciousness has already taken place. It was only necessary to say about this. Nothing more remained. This is confirmed also by the correspondence column of *Soviet Russia,* and by the letters sent to me home, by the discussions in the press and on the TV, in literature and in social life, for instance, this is seen well at electoral meetings....

In the first days there came 20 to 30 letters a day. Their daily number quickly reached 100. Then everything stopped suddenly–there was not a single letter for a whole week. She went to the post-office and the party committee of the institute. In a week the mail was recommenced. However, the weekly correspondence disappeared without leaving a trace. The post-office has nothing to do with it. There are even letters with the superscription "Nina Andreyeva, Leningrad, the Soviet Union". At first approximately 85 letters out of every 100 were from those who supported Nina Andreyeva's point of view on most of the questions raised by her. Fifteen letters were against her, but not against her views on life. There are sheer insults in these letters: checkmate, threats and obscene drawings. There is even a letter containing a text of sentence, and also such ones in which the execution of the sentence is constantly postponed for a month or two. It is just the time to apply to the militia. However, Nina Alexandrovna does not do so. She considers that such letters are akin to many printed views addressed to her, in other words, one of the same kind. The only difference is that the latter is written carefully, but the former is written clumsily so that it does not smell of Russian. The authorship hides behind the printed letters, without any signatures and any return addresses.

–I am not Sherlock Holmes, so as to inquire into who writes to me in such a strained way. True, there are sometimes one and the same handwriting and approximately the same text of threats. But the signature is different each time. I have even a pile of 17 such messages from Leningrad. There is an ornate, nervous hand: "Get away, to the prison! To the camp!..."

–And, hasn't anyone tried to defend you for this year?

–Defend? Publicly? I know only one case. The newspaper *Rigas bals* published a reply to one of the authors. And that is all. But I have many letters from lawyers who sincerely offer me their service at the court. One man even visited me and said from the threshold: "I'll defend you." I replied to him: "It is necessary to defend not me, but our ideals, our young people who are suffering more than anyone else from the split of social consciousness and emotionally receptive more than anyone else to the defeatist criticism which actually does not meet with a rebuff." I realize that they beat not me but my mode of thinking, my ideological world, which was, I think, hostile to someone already until 1917. However, I remember what is written to me. And also that the message has changed this year. Now not 85 letters out of every 100, but 90 support my position. This also backs me up....

–For all that, who are you, Nina Alexandrovna?

–I was born in Leningrad in 1938. I was christened at Nikolskaya Church. My parents, believers, were peasants of Tver, whom the hunger of 1929 tore away from Seliger, where all my forefathers had lived. My mother became a metal worker at the Kirov Factory and worked there until her pension, until she could not stand it any longer. My father loaded steamers at the Leningrad Port. We lived at No. 77 in Fontanka. It was some two steps from the Bolshoi Dramatic Theatre, the whole repertoire of which I knew from memory. True, I never took my seat at the stalls, but only at the gallery for three roubles–now 30 kopecks. There were five children in my family. My father was killed in 1941 at the battery defending Leningrad. In 1943 my elder sister fell in the battles for the defence of Donbass. My elder brother was mutilated in the storm into Berlin and died of the wounds.... I finished School No. 322 at Borodinskaya Street with a gold medal. Then I completed a technological institute with a "red diploma". Soon I defended a thesis for a master's degree. Its theme carried me away very much.

I joined the party in 1966. In the year when I defended my thesis I was married to Vladimir Ivanovich, also a master of science. I have a daughter named Svetlana and a grandson Vitaly, named so in honour of Vitaly Bonivur....

–I know that not only last year but also for the last twenty years you have been overcome with troubles, all kinds of conflicts, discords, dismissals from work and even exclusion from the party. What is the reason for this? Is it because of you and of your principles? And will it be possible to manage without these lines in your biography?

The cloudless life (if it is possible to call so my life with my mother on a little more than 100 roubles a month) ended in 1969 after the defence of my thesis. I came to the institute of quartz glass, sincerely wishing to engage in scientific searches, but I could not stay "in a corner with a book". I attempted to burst through the curtain of silence at the party meetings which was already habitual at that time. For my criticism, especially when it was applied to the leading figures at the institute, I was excluded from the party all of a sudden. This was done by the party bureau. However, the meeting, no matter how they attempted to pursuade, did not support this decision. They voted four times, but there was no result. In essence, this, maybe, was not silent support for my criticism, but, anyhow, this was the protest against the reprisal for me. Soon the commission made the situation clear, and those who had organized this reprisal were already punished. Then *Leningrad Pravda* supported me. Were it not for this newspaper, they would have voted for a fifth time... However, the work there, as the saying goes, did not shine for me. So I came back to my technological institute. There they elected me vice-secretary of the party bureau and the chairman of the group of people's control. And in 1978 there broke a storm which continued for two years. During this time they twice discharged me from my job and restored me. They excluded me from the party. And only the interference of the Committee of Party Control under the CPSU CC helped to take away all the accusations from me. And the storm was raised because of the letters which I unsuccessfully tried to "knock" into the waiting-room of Brezhnev. I put my name to the first three letters, but I sent the three subsequent ones without my signature, simply marking at the end: "chemist-technologist". At that time I did not know that all the letters, it turns out, were sent back to Leningrad, and went into the hands of those whom I had criticized in those letters. It was this that played a fatal role. While those letters signed by me were sent back, there were simply no replies to them. And only letters "without signature" met my eyes, printed in that old hand and by that old typewriter; they were given "pass" at once. They accused me of having fabricated anonymous letters. And only the trouble taken by the commissions confirmed that I was right. Moreover, disorder which was graver than that about which I had written, came to light all of a sudden. However, they concealed the matter, you see it coincided with the 150th anniversary of the institute, and many of "those who were trying to work" but did not succeed had just received government decorations and were, moreover, positively described in the press by Romanov, the then first secretary of the Leningrad regional party committee.

Although the matter was concealed, they did not forget me. My husband got it for the "bad education of his wife"–he was jobless for

two years. Now I could only dream of science. They allowed me only pedagogical practice, in which I am engaged with pleasure still now. However, those, who in 1980, although a little, nevertheless, "suffered" because of me,availed themselves of my present publication, which was so severely criticized, in order to carry through what was started by them in 1978. Of course, I was to blame. I was guilty in that I did not retreat, did not keep silence and was not frightened.

–Do you consider that they will continue to persecute you?

–Not only me. They refused my working with the students at leisure hours. More than once they called the students to the party committee, persuaded them to decline me as a teacher, but they did not do so. However, I am no more a curator. The students are unable to do anything here. And, not long ago, for instance, they arranged an open party meeting, inviting to it even people from the street, and troubled to inform of it in the press. However, even those unregistered who had "stolen into" the meeting from the organizations which I relate to my ideological opponents, say, from the so-called Democratic Union, after the meeting were indignant at how the meeting was conducted. I would say that they continue to persecute not only me. Literally, in a day after the TV commentary which was dedicated partly to my interview with *The New York Times*, my husband was fired. This was done without any explanations–he was allegedly said to have failed to pass the contest simply. At the academic council one question was asked of him: "Have you given advice to Nina Andreyeva?" He replied: "Yes." My daughter was made to leave Leningrad....

–Does not all this mean that both the technological institute and Leningrad have renounced you, who are of a different trend of thought, for there is no peace for you even within the native walls?

–It is so only partly, because the institute's renunciation of me took place at the time of the bloom of stagnation, and not of perestroika. Only partly, because those who try to settle a score with me, an old score, "in the name of perestroika", did this more actively "in the name of stagnation". Entering into the argument, I am aware of what I am doing. I would make too bold if I asserted that my opinion was absolute. And I will not allow myself to do so. I repeat: I wanted to express my opinion, but not to be published. Truth is born in argument–I was taught so. Do you remember our first Soviet government, the best-educated government in the world at the time–did they really not argue in it until they grew stupid? They argued. And not always did Lenin prevail. And he got it, and was beaten, too. However, they had an aim–they wanted to find a common, acceptable solution. But what is the aim of those who are attacking me? It is to create among the people the illusion of the uniformity of the solutions of our problems in the presence of actual variety and contradictoriness of the projects of solutions. So, they mean to deceive

the people?... In the unity and struggle of opposites is the first meaning of both nature and society. Why do we forget this as soon as we take an examination in philosophy?...

I have heard that last summer you visited Gory, Caucasia, where Stalin was born....

Yes, I did. I wanted to see the director of the Museum of Stalin and specify the quotation of Churchill which I had made use of in my article, and which, for some reason, those who criticized me ascribed to Trotskyist Isaak Doicher. Nothing of the kind. In the 1939 issue of the magazine *British Ally*, which after the "cold war" began to be named simply *England*, this quotation was published without any references to Doicher. In the liberaries of Moscow and Leningrad it was impossible to define it more exactly. They did not have the issue of the *British Ally* which was needed.

What do you want today?

I want to work, to meet the students not only at the lectures on physical chemistry. I want to reply to all the letters addressed to me and talk leisurely to all those who come to see me. Recently a worker from Ural visited me. With great agitation he swore that he would leave the party: it seemed jobs at the factory had worn him out so much. I talked with him for a long time. I said to him: "If I had thrown my party card onto the table each time I was vexed and embarrassed, then I would have stopped respecting myself already a long time ago. We are not members of the party of sufferers, but of fighters." Then a letter came from Ural. In this letter, thank God, there was not a single word about the party card, and not a single word about that momentary weakness. To tell you the truth, I had been waiting for this letter with uneasiness. In general, I learned much from letters and from those people who came to see me. Perhaps, I have even changed....

Kupchinsk News, Nos. 26-27, September 1989, pp. 2-5

* * *

DOES THE CRISIS CONTINUE?

There is no need to introduce Nina Alexandrovna Andreyeva to an enlightened reader. Until the recent broadcast *View* this person was perceived almost as a mythical one. And she is here in front of me–a tangible, living opponent of perestroika. It is interesting, but what do those who do not wish to give up principles think of social science?

How do you appreciate the situation as a whole?

I regard it as critical. Moreover, the crisis continues to deepen, reflecting the crisis in society and furthering it. I would like to put forward the "degeneration" of the pedagogical cadres, social scientists, in the first place. The accumulation of "grey colour" went on

under the influence of stagnant phenomena, and here perestroika worsened the situation still further.

Further, although the social scientists saw their mission in their direct contact with the students before, now they put forward to the foreground theses which nobody reads. We simply led the students away from Marxism-Leninism instead of introducing them into the creative laboratory of its founders. And, in conclusion, the expansion of the rights of the students to the choice of the instructors and courses should go hand in hand with the augmentation of order and discipline at higher educational institutions. There is no freedom without responsibility. There is deficiency of the latter in our universities.

–What can call forth new interest in social knowledge?

–The deeper the crisis, the greater the need for realizing its reasons and consequences. Hence, interest in social sciences will grow objectively. The way out of the crisis will be found through the struggle in ideology and politics, which will, in the final analysis, reflect class antagonism between the socialist and anti-socialist elements. Therefore, the calls for the deideologization of social sciences are diametrically opposed to the objective course of things. The discourse is, you see, on the satisfaction of social need. It is necessary to read the classics of Marxism-Leninism. In summer I re-read the works of Marx and Engels–in them there is a brilliant analysis of the classes and parties, and a masterly application of the dialectical and materialist explanation of history.

–What would you say about the last reforms undertaken by the State Committee of People's Education?

–They seem to me to be halfway and revisionist ones which open the way for the deideologization of social sciences. In particular, they combined the "living spirit of Marxism", dialectics, with anti-dialectics. The conversion of the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union into a socio-political history of the 20th century might be welcome, but, it seems to me, it would be more advisable to combine the history of the CPSU not with politics, but with the problems of the world working-class and communist movement, starting from the First International.

–What is, in your opinion, the place of social sciences in the educational system?

–One of the most important places should belong to social sciences at a university, independent of its type. I think that the problems of civil and political education will become sharp, and the necessity of intensifying it will increase. Therefore, the abolition of examinations and the switchover from the obligatory courses to facultative ones will not benefit us. A losing game is out of place here. The improvement of teaching of social sciences, to my mind, can be attained only on the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism as the

integral, developing world outlook of the international working class and all the genuinely socialist forces of the present. It is important that these sciences do not work for the dismantling of socialism in our country, using the slogans of perestroika as a cover. * Here, perhaps, the timeserving in which the social scientists are tied up is harmful as never before.

Newspaper *Novosibirsk Evening*, December 7, 1989, p. 3

* In her letter sent to the editorial board of the magazine *Young Guards* to be printed in the column "It Concerns Everyone", N. Andreyeva wrote: "One of the leading specialists of the history of our party is 'historian-Marxist' Roy Medvedev who, without shaking off dust from any one archival case, succeeded in publishing nearly 30 books in the West in the recent several decades. Yu. Afanasiev, rector of the Moscow Historical and Archival Institute, distinguished himself in his speeches by such a concentration of the statements and appraisals which defame the Soviet system and insult our people that even the foreign anti-Sovietists who are said to be world-wise are surprised at it. The one who is working on this path is Yu. Karyakin, inventor of 'Zhdanov-style liquid', scientific worker of the Institute of the World Working-Class Movement. (Yu. Karyakin smartly called N. Andreyeva 'Zhdanov-style liquid', 'acidity' alluding to her profession as a chemist.)

We would like to know when these rectors and scientific workers work receiving their proper salary, while they are continually driving about towns and villages, and not minding to travel to foreign countries. Their 'sensations' which are increased by the magazines and at the public lectures organized by the cooperators, not only lead to honour for the philistines, but also promote highly impressive financial success for their 'initiators'." (Magazine *Young Guards*, 1989, No. 7, p. 276.)

* * *

THE ASPIRATION FOR TRUTH IS NOT YET SUPPRESSED

In our country today everyone–from the general secretary of the party to the secretary of a primary party organization, from a minister to a worker, from an academician to a laboratory assistant–is taking a secret examination for their loyalty to Marxism-Leninism. It is by no means only the holders of high posts, academic degrees and ranks, and State decorations including those of laureates that pass this examination successfully. Many of them, who are used to swear in vain to be loyal to scientific-proletarian world outlook, not infrequently turn out to be objectively on the opposite side of the historic barricade lying between the working people and the drones. There are also many of such people who seek socialism in Denmark and Sweden, and who "ennoble" Hitlerism, putting the sign of equality between it and "feudal socialism". It is not only socialist pluralism that opened the locks through which gushed out the ideological and political concepts of destruction, fraught with calamities for toiling

people.

Serious apprehensions for the destiny of the fatherland worry very many Soviet people, part of whom turn to me, too. Being unable to answer every one of them (although I strive to do so), I was compelled to appeal to the editorial board of the magazine *Young Guards* * with a letter in April 1989, which was published in the seventh book for this year. I was well aware that it would be far from being easy for the editors of this youth magazine to publish my letter, taking into consideration the experience of the newspaper *Soviet Russia.* The reaction of *Ogonyok, Moscow News,* the radio "Freedom" and a number of the Western press organs was prompt. I consider it my civic and party duty to answer their criticism.

One of those who responded to the publication of my letter in *Young Guards* was Gennady Lisichkin, people's deputy, doctor of economic sciences and prominent "architect" of the present economic reform. In his article "Nina Andreyeva–the Pros and Cons", published in *Moscow News* (No. 33, August 13, 1989), the critic made in many respects an interesting attempt to analyse the reasons of the "righteousness of optimism" of the supporters of my views. Unfortunately, the prominent scientist did not refrain from those assertions which do not decorate him.

However, what is far more important in G. Lisichkin is that it is quite possible to agree to many propositions of his article. As for me, I could even sign some of them. In particular, who will object to the doctor of economic sciences who says that "the world experience proves that when the strategy and tactics of economic development are chosen correctly, the results make themselves felt without delay?" Or who will reject the longing "for such social figures who have their own proper face and opinion on all important matters and do not change it at the first opportunity that offers", the longing that came into being in our country a long time ago? Similar coincidences of the views of the author of the letter addressed to *Young Guards* and of her critic could continuously be cited, but it is much more important to dwell on the problematic matters raised by him.

It is understandable that the creator of the model of "market socialism" does not accept the traditionalism of the "opponents of the market". Today, because the latter is not let into mass press, it is safe to ascribe to them wage-levelling, reckless run-down of the lease and cooperatives and many other things incompatible with the "high science" which has done many things for four years to turn the "individual critical phenomena" of the stagnant period into the deep economic, social, political and ideological crisis of the present time. And then, the doctor of sciences G. Lisichkin had an opportunity to be acquainted with the views of V. Yakushev, an "opponent of the market", whose most interesting article "Is the All-Russian Extraordinary Committee Needed for Perestroika?" was published in the same issue of the magazine in which my letter was published.

The people's deputy accused me of embellishing not only the past, but also the present, citing an extract from my letter sent to *Young Guards*, having abridged it beforehand. Probably, the fact that the editorial board, in view of the shortage of the "space" in the magazine, cutting down my letter slightly with my consent, was conducive to the given conclusion. In particular, the abridged part concerned the characteristic of some features of the "national revolution" of 1956 in Hungary and the "Prague spring" of 1968 in Czechoslovakia.

The furious "pioneer of perestroika" evidently overdid it, asserting that I suggest not to dramatize the economic crisis which has now reached considerable depth. At the same time, having masterly "dramatized" the economic situation himself, G. Lisichkin demands that the readers understand "that all these shortcomings are the result not of perestroika, but of the accumulation of the preceding decades". Then, how to understand his assertion that "when the strategy and tactics of economic development are chosen correctly, the results make themselves felt without delay"? It is now already the fifth year of perestroika! Hence he strives to save from criticism his colleagues, economists, whose recommendations are allegedly "not realized or realized, so that the idea itself is discredited". In other words, the Council of Ministers, Gosplan, ministries and economic organs, which are not in a hurry to realize the plans of people like Shmelev, Abalkin and Zaslavskaya are to blame for everything. On the contrary, maybe, the leaders of industry, agriculture, science and administrative organs, who have not lost the feeling of responsibility for the destiny of the socialist fatherland, seeing in practice the destructive character of the projects of the present economists-reformers for the country, and do not allow the sorry experimenters to spoil things completely and to derail once and for all the economy of the country, and at the same time, the hopes of the people for the success of socialist perestroika?

The readers of *Moscow News* learned with great interest from the article of G. Lisichkin that today our state debt makes up 312 billion roubles (!), but, unfortunately, the author did not mention that one third of this gigantic sum is the "achievement" of the last year of perestroika, and that the accumulation of the deficit of the yearly budgets started from the beginning of the 80s. So the attempt of the respected scientist to defend the honour of the respresentatives of the "market economy" by referring to the repression of the 30s seems to be totally funny. This trend, he emphasizes, "was persecuted just as at one time genetics and cybernetics were", since "for bureaucrats are needed not scientists, but smooth-tongued lackeys of science". However, half a century has passed since then, and are not our renowned professors and academicians-economists going to become like the old dame from a popular proverb, who called herself an orphan until she was 80 years old? If the people's deputy considers that the economy of "market socialism" represented by

him and his colleagues did not grow from the short trousers of dilettantism owing to some reasons, then why should they delude the government and the people with their recommendations and programmes as the pioneers?

I wholly and completely agree with the people's deputy who writes: "There is little joy in that they will tell me about the regular catastrophe not in a couple of months after it happened, but on the very day.... All this consoles one if the adoption of prompt and effective measures follows the public statement of negative facts." Here is raised the problem of the practical result of glasnost, the significance of which it is difficult to overestimate. It seems that we are at the most distant approaches to the solution of this problem. In my letter sent to *Young Guards* was raised the problem of the informative value of glasnost in its gnosiological (truth, trustworthiness and demonstrativeness) and moral (social responsibility) aspects, which in our conditions are extremely urgent for some press organs. To my regret, my respected critic considered it possible to pass this, in my opinion, more important problem.

In conclusion I would like to thank the doctor of economic science and the editorial board of *Moscow News* for the attention they have paid to my letter published in *Young Guards*. I cannot but mention also with satisfaction that people's deputy G. Lisichkin did not abase himself by fixing unfounded labels to the criticized author, although he adheres to positions "diametrically opposite to those which Andreyeva and her supporters maintain".

Of a completely different character is the article "An Infuriated Critic of Gorbachev" published in No. 33 of *Ogonyok*. S.M. Lyamkin who had prepared this article for publication, with the noble aim of "suppressing idle talks and concoction, cordially thanks David Ramnick correspondent of the *Washington Post*, who had "communicated the text of the above-mentioned talk". For the time being it is difficult for me to judge whom the cowboy methods belong to–to the interviewer himself or to translators and editors of *Ogonyok*.** It is difficult to say here who has borrowed from whom the innumerable fantasies which distorted everything, beginning with my biographical data, reducing on the whole the serious talk to the level of base sensations and of the judgements ascribed to me, which are not habitual to me and are considered to be indecent for us, which, it is true, are in wide use in the American press. The aim of the publication of a similar thing may be, in my opinion, only one–to overwhelm and do away with his opponent morally. It is characteristic that David Ramnick who had requested me repeatedly to meet him and give him an interview, in his first publication of my only talk with him "A New Soviet Political Organization in Favour of Return to Communist Ideals" (The *Washington Post* dated June 28, 1989), objectively expounded on the whole the views of his interlocutor. As a matter of course, from his anti-communist position. ***

It is not only hopeless and meaningless, but also unnecessary to refute, correct and specify the endless inventions, distortions and piglings in the article of *Ogonyok*. If truth remains to be such to the end, then lie has the peculiarity that it itself dies, not having life-giving soil in reality. However, lest the readers of *Ogonyok* should think as if in the interview it was talked only about rock and roll, cookery, "spies-cosmopolitans", the secret views of the "leaders of Kremlin", the "beastly sexuality" of men or about the notorious "Jewish problem" in the USSR, but the most "lofty theme" was allegedly the question about the "State which puts order before anything else", I consider it necessary to acquaint the reader with some of my answers given to the questions put the day before by the American correspondent by phone. These answers were recorded by him. The acquaintance with these answers will allow those, if desirable, to form their own opinion of the content of the article of *Ogonyok* and judge its objectivity themselves. Here are the questions and answers.

How do you appraise the situation in the country and the results of First Congress of the People's Deputies of the USSR? Is it possible to regard the present course of perestroika as acceleration of the development of Soviet society?

I do not think so, rather on the contrary. The successes of our perestroika are so modest and meagre that almost nothing was mentioned about them in the speeches of people's deputies at the congress. Instead of this, the failures, mistakes and the shocks called forth by them were elucidated in all aspects, not infrequently with relish.

In fact, can one really not be disappointed at the further lag of the development of the material and technical basis through the instillation of new technique and technology, the success of "shady economy", "black" market and speculation, at the expansion of the sphere of unearned incomes, at distortion in cooperative construction, at the deficit of the state budget and increase of external state debts unknown even in the years of the war, at the galloping inflation, at the depreciation of the rouble, at the drop in the real living standard of the Soviet people, 43 million of whom are living in extreme poverty, and at the legalization of the so-called "socialist" millionaires and smart dealers who, having invested their circulating fund in the major spheres of the state, are deforming the economy?

In recent years we have obviously promoted the crisis of the working-class and communist movement of the world, and complicated the situation of socialist countries. Seized in a deep crisis were Poland and Hungary in which, as Yan Foitik, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, justly remarked, they buried not only Imre Nady, but also communism. We objectively hurry to instigate the German Democratic Republic,

the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and Bulgaria to the pseudo perestroika of that type.

All this leads to that the CPSU is gradually forfeiting the vanguard role in the revolutionary and communist movement of the world, intending, apparently, to pass it to the Communist Party of China, the leaders of which are pretending to it for a long time. It seems that their peculiar claim was the resolute destruction of the counterrevolutionary actions in Beijing, the reshuffle of the Chinese leadership and the censure of those who pandered to the illegal subversive activities on Tien An Men Square.

The situation in our country confirmed the apprehension which I expressed at one time in connection with the purport of M.S. Gorbachev's assertion, namely, that in the course of perestroika we must first "shake the old tree, then root it out, grow a new forest and obtain the fruit" (*Pravda*, September 25, '88). Similar directions for shaking socialism and "extirpating" its roots obviously instigated O. Shabad, an American specialist of the Soviet Union, to declare at the "round table" of the magazine *Ogonyok* that "If Gorbachev gains a victory, then capitalism will triumph in the USSR."And the editor of the magazine with his colleagues did not even attempt to object to such an interpretation of perestroika, which, it turns out, suits them.

Thus, during perestroika there have been formed and become apparent in our country two mutually opposed and mutually exclusive in their content processes, the antagonism of which defines the character and perspectives of the political and socio-economic situation in the country. Not only in our country.

I reaffirm that it is not match, consolidation, harmony and "mutual enrichment" but antagonism, as our "bourgeois neo-liberals" maintain. In our country the "superintendents of spirit" also emphasize the contradictoriness of the processes and tendencies of perestroika, but in this they attempt to conceal and overshade the really opposing forces, smear their class content, and substitute them for antagonism between "Stalinists" and "anti-Stalinists", between Zionists and anti-Zionists, between Russophobes and Russophiles, between "conservatives" and "revolutionaries", between "democrats" and "bureaucrats", between "Rightists" and "Leftists", between nationalists and chauvinists and the like.

In reality, in the arena of modern social and political struggle of the country there was clash between the anti-socialist forces which are comparatively not numerous, but are organized well, proficient in demagogy and backed up abroad and on the side of revisionist elements in all the echelons of party-state apparatus, on the one hand, and the vast masses for whom the socialist choice and communist perspective of the country are dear, on the other hand.

The latter makes up the absolute majority, but they are disunited, unorganized and subjected to ideological pressing on the side of the propagandists of an anti-communist platform who have seized a considerable part of mass media. They are also disoriented because

of the inconsistent position of the demoralized party and Soviet apparatus. The spontaneous protest of the "silent majority" was not only the mass actions against the cooperators, but also the numerous strikes in almost all the regions of the country, not infrequently developing into political strikes; this was shown particularly in the Baltic republics, in the coal basins of the country and in the activity of the nations' fronts.

I would like to add something to the answer given to the American correspondent. Our "pioneers of perestroika" are fond of flirting with dialectics, not infrequently substituting it for hackneyed evolutionism. From the "sum and substance of Marxism" they have imperceptibly castrated the law which Lenin called the nucleus and essence of dialectics: namely the law of the unity and conflict of opposites.

Let us take perestroika as the law-governed stage of the development of our society. In the first couple of years the process of perestroika advanced in our country as a single current which practically did not know opponents, contradictions and doubts. However, towards the end of 1987 there were shown differences of opinion, mainly through the difference in the appraisal of the socialist past of the country. Later on, these differences started to reflect the present and assume a highly essential character, giving rise to the uneasiness and apprehension of the Soviet people. The latter (uneasiness and apprehension) was particularly reflected in my letter published in the newspaper *Soviet Russia* dated March 13, 1988. The subsequent events confirmed that my apprehension was by no means unfounded. If we use philosophical terminology, it is possible to say that the differences which came into being in the lap of perestroika, have now "sharpened to become opposites" which bear antagonistic and mutually exclusive character. Is it really possible to make the subsequent development of socialism compatible with any forms of the restoration of capitalism, the interests of home-bred millionaires and cooperative parvenus with the interests of the vast masses of the working people, the exploiters with the exploited, the oppressors with the oppressed, nationalism with internationalism, patriotism with cosmopolitism and many other things that are attempted to be done by those who presumptuously call themselves the disciples and followers of Lenin? Only the ideological and socio-political struggle will determine which course the current of perestroika will take in the future. This struggle objectively appears as the source and motive power of the transformations in our society and as the basis of the perspective of its subsequent development. However, it is enough of theorizing, now let's pass on to the text of the interview held on June 24, 1989.

The antagonistic tendencies of the processes of perestroika, distorted by the means of mass media, also found their so much distorted reflection in the debates of the First Congress of the People's Deputies of the USSR. Already when preparations were being made

for this congress, the so-called "strong democratic minority" was formed and worked out its programme. It was joined mainly by the deputies from Moscow, Leningrad, the Baltic regions, Moldavia and some other regions. Some of them succeeded in visiting foreign countries before the congress for the assimilation of experience of bourgeois parliamentarism, and in receiving appropriate "wishes" in the West. Literally from the first minutes of the work of the congress they attempted to take the initiative in their hands. They succeeded in taking up 60 per cent of the debate time, something that, of course, did not conform either to their number at the congress, or to the social base which they represented.

The irony of the destiny is that our mass media started to call, for some reason, the ideologues of the "strong democratic minority" the "Leftists". However, it is known that in the international working-class and communist movement those figures, who betrayed their class, slipped down from scientific proletarian positions and insisted upon a bourgeois way of life and bourgeois relations, were always qualified as Right-wing opportunists and revisionists. Those leaders who by their "drifting" position connive at the renegades in some way or other, should be included here.

As is seen, the criterion here is not the words, but the deeds and, in the final analysis, the vector of social and political aspirations. Therefore, the "strong democratic minority", which Sakharov promised to turn into a majority soon, is Right-wing opportunist in its aspirations. To call the majority of the congress that defended socialism and the communist orientator of perestroika "Rightist" is, in essence, provocative. How, for instance, Deputy Sergei Chernovonopisky, former soldier-Afghan and Secretary of the Cherkasky City Committee of the Komsomol, whose main life principles are the "Power, Motherland and Communism", can be a "Rightist"! It would be quite possible to number among the Rightists B. Yeltsin as well as the so-called "Yeltsinism" engendered by him, or the adventurous-demagogic and authoritarian ignominious policy.

–Which of the two opposite tendencies gained the victory at the First Congress of the People's Deputies?

–I think that no one gained complete victory. On the first face it seems that much turned out well for the "strong democratic minority". They successfully used the loftiest tribune of the country for the propaganda of their restorationist ideas. Under their pressure some political formulas were moved to the "Rightist" and posts were won at the Supreme Soviet, at its commissions and in the government. However, evidently they did not have sufficient kinetic energy for the essentially planned movement to the Right. This time the potential energy of socialism in the masses as a whole turned out insurmountable for the "pioneers". And this is not fortuitous. The 70 years following the October Revolution created at huge costs a new "quality of the masses" which it is impossible to overcome at once by the manipulation of the consciousness of the working people.

Historic experience has shown that the switchover from private ownership of the means of production to public ownership is possible only through the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the worker-peasant state which came out, comes out and will come out in the most diverse form. It is naive to think that the reverse switchover of the ownership into the private hands is possible without the political structure, the essence of which is the dictatorship of the very home-bred neo-bourgeoisie, whose formation is now successfully promoted in our country. The "superintendents of spirit" perfect the ideological platform of the new political system, preliminarily having anathematized the concept of ideology itself. Apparently they calculated that the Congress of the People's Deputies of the USSR would mark the switchover to their dictatorship, which would be possible either in the bourgeois-democratic or authoritarian form. The latter form frightens them not only by that it might take extreme forms, but also by the vagueness of the answer to the question: in whose hands may the power be held? This fright was not infrequently expressed in their speeches. (It splashed out also at the subsequent pretentious meetings of the "People's Fronts" and "Democratic Union".)

In other words, at first sight the "liberal minority" seemed to have won the victory, but it did not achieve its main strategic goal, about which its representatives are now so emotionally distressed. I would like to draw historic analogy with the Borodino battle of 1812, which finally ended by the victory of the Russian Army, in spite of the retreat and surrender of Moscow. I think that it is also possible to appraise in the same way the Congress of the People's Deputies, where victory remained with the sound socialist forces of the society on which it was not successful to impose the "neo-liberal" conceptions of the restoration of capitalism. Moreover, everywhere in the social consciousness of Soviet people there took place an evident turn to the side of the understanding of the danger hanging over socialism and over the communist perspective of the development of mankind.

Those who were the first to perceive this were the Moscow intellectuals who were sensitive to the conjuncture and put into circulation such words as the "Abalkanization" and "Popovization" of the economy, and the "Helmanization" and "Grossmanization" of culture.

Many Soviet and party workers came to themselves from lethargy, and the theorists of anti-market economy who are not admitted to the press, became active. But the main thing is that wide sections of the people have begun to understand that the struggle in the country is going again along the principle: who will win?, as was in the first decade of the Soviet power. Hence, the questions put at the lectures, the appraisal of political figures and the character of the letters sent to the editorial board change. New societies like the United Front of the Working People, or the All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and

Communist Ideals" are coming into being. Patriotic societies and unions get rid of "infantile diseases", reform and attain maturity.

This and many other things now give the possibility to declare that there will be no restoration of capitalism in the USSR and that the creeping counterrevolution will not pass!

On what was I based in speaking of all this to my "guest", to David Ramnick, reporter of an influential American newspaper in Moscow, whom I agreed to meet after his four insistent requests?

First of all, on the rapid growth of the political consciousness of the working people who are now seriously thinking about the long-term and immediate perspectives of the development of their country. As Maxim Gorky liked to repeat, "if people only start to think, they always think until they hit upon truth."

Leningrad,
Young Guards, No. 2, 1990

---

* In her letter "Glasnost Should Do the Following", Nina Andreyeva puts the question: "Isn't it time to stop the activity of the advocates of pseudo perestroika? They will hardly confine themselves to the 'shooting of ballot-papers' at the election campaigns. The events in the Baltic regions, Armenia and Georgia make us think of this." (*Young Guards*, 1989, No. 7, p. 277.)

** The newspaper *New Russian Word* (New York) dated August 4, 1989 reprinted the translation of D. Ramnick's article under the title "Interview of an American Journalist with a Chief Soviet Woman Stalinist," which allowed one to judge that the translators and the editors of the *Ogonyok* diligently worked to intensify the abusive style of Mr. Ramnick.

*** As it was known later on, David Ramnick, having published his second article "An Infuriated Critic of Gorbachev" one month later (July 18, 1989), succeeded in taking part in a Zionist congress in Moscow on the basis of that only interview.

* * *

The Department of Journalism of the Moscow Higher Party School once addressed the following questions to a number of political figures, scholars and writers:

1. How do you personally regard glasnost? How do you understand it? What are, in your opinion, the indications, criteria and indices of glasnost? In general, on what foundations is it possible to judge of the status of glasnost?

2. What can you say about the development of glasnost after the April, 1985? Is it even or not? Is it possible to say about any stages of this development? If possible, then what are their peculiarities?

3. What new features has glasnost found following the 19th Party Conference? Has the resolution of the Party Conference on glasnost really given anything? What, in general, should be the role of the party organs including those at higher levels, the party as a whole in the development of glasnost?

4. Does glasnost require any restrictions today? Or is it such a blessing which is never in plenty? Can people make use of glasnost to their detriment? Doesn't this take place in some regions of our country? What are, in general, the trends of the development of glasnost in our society? What are the prospects of glasnost? What should be expected, what should be hoped for and what should be feared?

5. What are the real guarantees ensuring irreversibility in the development of glasnost? When, under what conditions and approximately in what years can glasnost actually become the standard of life in our society?

The answers given by 64 public figures are carried in the collection of articles *The Fate of Glasnost Is the Fate of Perestroika.* One of the answers is the writing of N. Andreyeva *A Road to Truth, Truth Does Not Come of Its Own Accord.*

A ROAD TO TRUTH, TRUTH DOES NOT COME OF ITS OWN ACCORD

I own that before expressing my views as regards the questions raised it is necessary to note that the issue of glasnost is raised in the abstract, separated from fundamental economic and other issues concerning perestroika at the present time, and that the issue of glasnost is not connected to the Leninist explanation with regard to socialist democracy.

Thus the claim that glasnost is, in the long run, an issue of the superstructure that is always restricted by the processes of the "foundation", and primarily an issue characterized by political and moral aspects, is being disregarded, both consciously and subconsciously. I think the abstract attitude to an understanding of glasnost becomes perverted in choosing between the liberal bourgeois understanding and the proletarian understanding of glasnost.

Such an attitude also enables glasnost to lose its inherent party and class characters at different stages of the history of human development. In considering these judgements I would like to give my answers as briefly as possible to the questions raised.

1. I think that glasnost is the most important element of all the forms of democratic system, being the means and method, as well as the tool, to solve the socio-economic and ideological and political problems. Glasnost is the pluralism of opinions making it possible to offer the people complete, profound and wide-ranging information and to compare their standpoints and opinions and judge them; it is freedom of speech, while, at the same time, the end of the "confined themes" for criticism and self-criticism and of the "closed zones", and it represents the intention to solve the pending problems of history and the present era. Herein lies the obvious value of glasnost for the whole of humanity. I think, however, in all these cases glasnost for glasnost's sake does not exist. Glasnost is the road to truth, but itself is not the truth. Glasnost is necessary to achieve the most brilliant success in solving the concrete social problems. I am guided by the opinion that the appropriate standard for such solution is the integrated indications of the effects of glasnost.

2. In the mid–80s the critical phenomena that exposed the danger to the future development of socialism were stockpiled in our society. Their causes were mentioned on several occasions in the party's documents, including the decision of the 27th Congress of the

CPSU. One of these causes was the lack of glasnost within our society. Due to the stagnation glasnost had an artificially narrow framework and an extremely fragmented and one-sided character. In other words, it was impossible to work out and adopt decisions concerning such domains as the economy, politics, culture and ideology. From April 1985 onwards, a new stage was opened in the history of the country. It was declared that to revive glasnost completely and perfectly had become the objective.

Is it necessary to argue about any special period or stage of the development of glasnost following the April Plenary Meeting of the CC of the CPSU in 1985? I think not. As far as I am concerned, in the development of glasnost some major stages were noted, but the period was too short. As far as this is concerned, my personal experience shows it, just as the experiences of other comrades do.

On March 13, 1988, the newspaper *Soviet Russia* carried my letter in which I tried to express my apprehension concerning some phenomena in society. What I can say now is that in the letter I based my opinion on Marxist-Leninist principles (the necessity of adopting party and class, concrete and historic attitudes to present and past phenomena, the necessity of the decisive role of the working class and its Leninist party in socialist construction and perestroika, the necessity of the class and all-human, national and international dialectics, etc.) which had been tested historically by the people, and on the major party and state documents and the speeches of those comrades such as Gorbachev, Ligachev, Chevrikov and Yakovlev as well as other leading figures.

Two days after the publication of my letter titled "I Cannot Give Up Principles", A. Jinkevich, one of the directors of the film, *Time of Hope,* about S.M. Kirov whom I mentioned in my letter, phoned me that I would receive scathing criticism in the central newspaper *Pravda,* and that the newspaper *Soviet Russia* would end its relations with me. I took this ironically, but soon changed my mind. On April 5, the newspaper *Pravda* carried an essay titled "Principles of Perestroika: the Sense of Revolution in Thoughts and Action" in which I was branded as a proponent of "the ideological programme and the declaration of an anti-perestroika force" and many terrible criticisms were levelled at me in radio broadcasts in Western countries. Such a judgment was too much for me who, a mere university teacher, a "technocrat", wanted to share my pain, anxiety and doubts with my fellow countrymen for the first time through a central newspaper.

The day after the publication of the essay in *Pravda* A. Jinkevich again phoned me to enquire as to whether or not "I was disgusted." Having heard my negative reply and leading questions, Arkadi Avramovich confirmed that it was they–he himself, Shatrov, Rybakov, Geliman, Samsonov, Tovstonogov and other elected delegates of the intelligentsia–who had their essay carried in *Pravda*. With a view to cheering me up the film director consoled me, saying

that they "would not keep me behind bars." But after April 5 the all-out "exposure" of my "anti-perestroika" started. For more than a year the "spiritual leaders" have been using various rostra, including the highest one, to slander and hurl abuse at me. They, having lost their senses of reality, went to the length of urging the delegates to the party conference, people's deputies of the USSR and candidates for the Soviet to say whether "they supported the programme of Gorbachev or of Nina Andreyeva." Victor Konezuki, a writer, was more active than others. He grew extremely agitated and even went so far as to brand me before millions of television viewers as "a bawd in a brothel." You should judge for yourselves what level "glasnost" and the morals of its major proponents have reached.

After the publication of my letter in *Soviet Russia* strange rumours were rife with regard to its copyright. But, no one attempted to refute the lies, even though my original letter was kept by various newspaper publishing companies including *Pravda* . What surprised me as regards this matter was that the editor-in-chief of the newspaper *Pravda* "discovered" in his radio address on the day of the press that "this woman" still existed. I think it would not have been difficult for him to confirm long before that the writer of the letter carried in the newspaper *Soviet Russia* , the letter which was the point of his criticism, was not a ghost, for my address and telephone number had been kept by the editorial board of the newspaper. All my attempts to publish a reply to the essay carried in *Pravda* came to naught. For they did not reply. They did not even express an opinion with regard to my assertion in my letter that the original quotation I used in the text of my letter had been distorted and that the references on the judgement given of J.V. Stalin I quoted had not been presented by the Trotskyite Isaak Doicher but by Winston Churchill. As far as this matter is concerned, some publications in the USSR, such as *British Ally* confirm the facts.

The newspaper discussions in *Pravda* about the essay were one-sided. I received more than 6,000 letters which were against the essay in *Pravda,* and about 700 copies of essays contributed to central newspapers with contents similar to mine. On the letters I found no appeal for a multi-party system or for the abolition of kolkhoz and sovkhoz or for secession from the USSR. The writers of the letters were veteran soldiers and young people, smelters and coal-miners, engineers and professors, generals and admirals, heroes and heroines of the USSR and socialist labour heroes and heroines, activists of perestroika. The essay "The Principles of Perestroika: the Sense of Revolution in Thoughts and Action" exposes its writers' low theoretical level and marked a turning-point in the orientation towards glasnost. Another turning-point was the 19th All-Union Conference.

I support and approve all the propositions of the decision of the party conference "on glasnost". Thanks to glasnost I was able to

give my answers, through *Moscow News*, to the paroxysm of the censure given by M. Ulyanov and A. Jinkevich. In reality, the "basket" of the editorial board cooked up new lies and a fresh rumour rather than refuting my argument. It is probably not accidental that later M. Ulyanov became perplexed by the question carried in the newspaper *Boljusky Ahutostroitsely* asking, "What should be done with Nina Andreyeva and people like her?" Such is glasnost. *Smena* in Leningrad, dissatisfied by the verbal abuse of me, even carried provocative pictures on three pages. The middle was a magnified portrait of me. On my left were drawn young people attacking the Winter Palace under the slogan of perestroika and glasnost. On my right was a filthy warehouse in which were furled flags and a small portrait of M.S. Gorbachev on the wall under which was a vase of flowers. Institutions adorn the portraits of dead people in such a way. When I protested against the picture, the editor W. Yurin replied bureaucratically by mail.

A few days ago the newspaper *Leningrad University* carried an editorial related to the speech I gave before some university students, in which it distorted all it could and then criticized this distorted standpoint. The editorial began as follows. "You used to say why it was necessary to write about Nina Andreyeva and uselessly talk about the woman's personality and ideas.... You would encourage the Stalinists by releasing Nina's writings on principles, though the content of her writings is negated by the editorial board". What is characteristic is that when the full text of the above-mentioned essay in *Leningrad University* was carried in the youth publications all the elements of the already scanty objectivity were expunged. As a result, the high quality of the decision "on glasnost" failed to guarantee the true glasnost realistically.

4. I think that glasnost has its limits and boundaries. It is preposterous to understand glasnost as the possibility to transmit openly every manner of sophism, irrespective of anything. If I am misled, bedlam will be acknowledged as the ideal model for glasnost. Glasnost is not boundless. As everyone knows, glasnost does not cover military and state secrets, or economic and scientific and technical secrets. But glasnost does not restrict the freedom of speech or reject pluralism of opinions or revive "restricted zones" and leave intact the maiden land of history. The point lies somewhere else.

The ideologists of ancient Greece were aware that glasnost, like democracy, was socially useless without limits and discovered prescriptions for the dominant clan communities to establish it. Now some mass media are attempting to force a liberalist and bourgeois understanding of glasnost and democracy on us as a model, something which has been rejected by most of the world's population since 1917. The empty talk in Hyde Park in London for centuries has evoked sneers from many experienced people. But, in our country there are "Marxists" who are dreaming of keeping the mass-

assembly glasnost of Hyde Park in nearly every city. And because they are obsessed by street-wise "democracy" the "Marxists" are conniving at the fact that blood is spilling out already in many areas instead of speeches.

At the conference of people's deputies glasnost in our country was spoken of by deputies as something to be monopolized by individual political groups or intellectuals. This indicates that we are ignorant of how to make proper use of socialist society in which the mass media are not owned by any group but by all the people. We witness frequent repetitions by newspapers, magazines and radio broadcasts, that usually elicit disgust and indignation from many people. We cannot draw any matter of principle and importance from the noisy farce of those who do their best to win public favour and who are keeping relationship with fellows or social system. Here we are approaching the philosophical and moral limit of glasnost.

I think that the philosophical requirement of glasnost is the objectivity, truthfulness, exactness and logic of all news. Contrary to these are subjectivism, falseness, inaccuracy, illogic, fabrication and nihilism. To avoid bias is important from the point of view of epistemology, but in consideration of the standpoint of judgement and social phenomena, adopting various attitudes is not good, either. As everyone knows, the social stand and political prejudice of people affect the work of distinguishing between what is important and unimportant, what is essential and inessential and what is law-governed and accidental. But these normally cause deviation from the truth.

The moral aspect of glasnost is the sense of responsibility for "what will be the result of what we say". The contradiction in this is vicious agitation, irresponsibility, permissiveness and spontaneous action. These are particularly dangerous in settling the relations between nations and social disputes. Unfortunately, opinions which are contradictory to the development of our nation at the present stage are prevalent in some publications such as the magazines *Ogonyok* and *youth*, and the newspapers *Moscow News* and *Smena*, which are known as "yellow publications". The editorial boards of these publications seem to be seeking the role of the group of correspondents of "Freedom" and other foreign radio broadcasting companies.

Now the issue of the political limits of glasnost becomes crucial. I think this issue was always, is and will be in the future, too, as long as states have existed and will exist.

In the situation in which two different socio-economic systems exist, the liberalistic illusion of absolute glasnost is absurd. As far as socialist glasnost is concerned, we resolutely hold that the mass media of the Soviet state should not be handed over to people who are destroying socialism with the ambition of reviving the capitalist order. We must recognize that today anti-socialist groups in the

guise of "fanatical proponents of perestroika" have capitalized on the decision of the party conference "on glasnost" far better than party organizations.

In order to play its cleaning role properly the socialist river of glasnost must be deep and pure. The endless flow of bourgeois liberalism may create a shallow, filthy and stinking marsh or a small puddle. But another result may occur, that this muddy stream will give birth to the triumph of uncontrolable growth involving sudden human tragedy and social upheaval, and creating a state of anarchy.

Glasnost, without social limits and boundaries, may be an obstacle to social progress and detrimental to society*, I think.

The dialectics of our conflict-ridden times is as such. Today the main danger is, as far as I am concerned, that glasnost in our country has become similar to "game at one gate" and "one-way street". Moreover, this "street" does not lead to the temple foreseen by the great ideologues of progressive humanity but in the opposite direction.

5. Therefore, in the long run, the institution which is to offer a guarantee for genuine socialist glasnost is the CPSU, which should intensify its leadership over the mass media, and above all, widely inform society of the important matters that are vital to the working people, thoroughly implement the class line in matters of propaganda and agitation, and launch a more decisive counterattack against the ideological expansion of the enemies inside and outside the international communist movement.

The Fate of Glasnost Is the Fate of Perestroika, a collection of articles published by the Moscow Publishing House of Political Books, 1990, pp. 35-42

---

* N. Andreyeva wrote in *Young Guards*: "Poet A. Mezirov published the following poem dedicated to the participants in the Great Patriotic War on the occasion of the Victory Day in the *New World* No. 5 for 1988. Isn't it a malicious insult?

Why do you weep, old ruins?
Where is your sacred faith
In the revolution and Stalin,
In class essence of being?

With a number of mass media it has become an unwritten rule to curse many moral values which are prized in any society. (See *Young Guards*, No. 7 for 1989, p. 276.)

* * *

LET US PREVENT THE SOCIALIST FATHERLAND FROM BEING DRIVEN INTO CATASTROPHE*

The Soviet people greeted the beginning of the final decade of the 20th century amid an unprecedented crisis which disturbed all the activities of the Soviet state and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The counterrevolutionary branch of perestroika got the upper hand. The revolutionary gains of the October Revolution are now exposed to serious danger. The foundations of socialism which the Russian proletariat established in the revolutionary war and consolidated through their tireless efforts and which the older generations defended in bloody battles, are in danger of being destroyed. The plan to accelerate socio-economic development which M.S. Gorbachev proclaimed to the whole world brought about, within four years, the collapse of society and unprecedented economic dislocation, the paralysis of the uniform economic system of the country, strikes and inflation, a marked decline in living standards, poverty for the working people, bloody battles between nations, moral corruption, unprecedented ideological discord, a progressively increasing crime rate and the suffering of millions of innocent people. The crisis prevailing throughout society has infiltrated even into the Communist Party. Disorder and stagnation have appeared among the working masses and middle schools and institutes of higher learning are going to ruin. Scientific and technical progress has reached a stalemate. People's intelligence is being devoted to accumulating money and satisfying selfish desires by sacrificing society. The arrogant politicians and businessmen are frantic in their desire to sell everything to the West, from the Kuril Islands and the latest tanks to artistic wealth and girls of loose morals who make even the publishers of sex magazines panic because of their naked behaviour. In exchange they receive syringes for one time use, contraceptives, AIDS, old computers and second-hand cars.

The unified system of foreign trade has been totally destroyed. In order to extract our natural resources, make a breakthrough in the protective tariffs imposed by our country and expand the exploiting sphere of foreign capital in the cities and provinces of the Soviet Union, "free regions" and new enterprises have been established, in which foreign companies are involved. It is inevitable that this will pollute our natural surroundings and convert our territory into a world-wide dump-yard for industrial waste.

In my opinion, the conflicts between member republics of the Soviet Union were caused by the fact that the economically strengthened anti-socialist forces used nationalism, national egoism and a sense of national superiority to establish their restoration poli-

cy and deceive many of the working people. The anti-communist programme of those who have degenerated into national bourgeoisie became the kernel of perestroika. This caused the introduction of a multi-party system in the republics in the Baltic and in Transcaucasia, the requirement of converting land and the means of production to private ownership in a short span of time, active propaganda on the withdrawal of the republics from the Soviet Union and the transformation of the communist parties in these republics to social democratic and national communist parties.

It seems that the conflicts between nations are well coordinated in space and time, so it is difficult to take steps against them. The relations between organizations and the exchange of experience in unlawful nationalist activities have been regularized. The strained situation in one republic immediately infects other republics. The methods of their struggle become multifarious. This makes people think that nationalist violence and atrocities are international.

In creating hostility between nations in these republics and making the fear of Russia prevail among the inhabitants, Yu.Afanasiev, V. Korotich, Yu. Karyakin and other leaders of perestroika played a major role. These people conspired with local nationalists in a personal attack on the "occupation forces", an insult to the Soviet Army soldiers, in the destruction of Red flags in fire and in the debasement of the symbols of the proletariat. Foreigners, too, are keeping pace with them. At an international meeting held in Riga in the summer, a US congressman appealed openly to the Baltic republics to withdraw from the Soviet Union and congratulated them on hoisting the flag of the old bourgeois republic over party and government buildings. In this regard, I would like to ask a question. Suppose that an international meeting was held in San Francisco to discuss the life of the people in the state and that V. Korotich, a deputy of the Soviet Union, made a speech requesting the state to withdraw from the United States, what response would President Bush or the US Congress make? Or suppose that the flag of the United States was pulled down in Illinois and, instead, the flag and emblem of the United Kingdom, its former suzerain, were hoisted. What would US society think of this? Suppose that some bribed bandits appeared before the masses and burnt the flag of the Federal Republic of Germany and the puppets of its soldiers. And suppose that someone insulted the graves of the German soldiers who fell in action in the last war. The German people would never remain indifferent to such behaviour. Nobody will doubt what results such behaviour would produce. But, in our republics, such provocative acts take place in the presence of important party and government leaders and are absolutely free from any denunciation! The international front and the newspapers in military districts are indignant, but the time has come when we must raise the voice of resistance instead of indignation and exercise our power. Have we no law or people who will

enforce it?

We must emphasize that all the processes in the strained situation prevailing between nations have a historical background. The backgrounds vary, but we cannot overlook the fact that the Second Congress of the People's Deputies of the Soviet Union adopted a resolution "On the Political and Legal Appraisal of the Soviet-German Nonaggression Treaty in 1939". Most of the people's deputies committed an error by voting for this resolution. What is worse, they were forced to cast the ballot three times again. Apparently, A.N. Yakovlev, a member of the Political Bureau and a historian, the author of the "brilliant report" to this congress, and his fellow commission members defined this 1939 treaty as a "crime" which had long been regarded as "treason" in Russia. But this document holds an important place not only in the diplomatic history of the Soviet Union. Like the peace of Brest this treaty decided the destiny of the Soviet Union during a grave period in the history of the country.

It is necessary to consider how skilfully people's deputies diverted their debates from the most important political problems of the past and present to the question of the existence of a secret protocol. This question was aimed at diverting attention to minor subjects. Yakovlev said that the Berlin talks in August 1939 could have been confined to the treaty, and that, therefore, the protocol should be considered as a "deal" and "imperialist ambition". Anyone, even a historian, must understand that a treaty without a secret agreement is nothing but a blank sheet of paper.

Why is it necessary to reexamine the political appraisal of the Soviet-Germany Nonaggression Treaty? Is it necessary for telling the truth? No, it isn't. It is necessary to please the nationalists of the Baltic countries who are trying to discover a legal basis for breaking up the USSR. Moreover, the truth is not and cannot be decided by a vote. A vote by the respected people's deputies of the USSR falls under the same category. The number of votes of the deputies only reveals more or less correctly the political atmosphere and the relations of forces deciding a certain political problems; it cannot tell the historical truth.

I think that the German revanchists and neo-Nazis, the nobles of Poland and Romania, the heirs to the mental wealth of Mannerheim's Finland and the unreasonable nationalists of the Baltic republics who are trying to restore capitalism and withdraw from the Soviet Union are making the most effective use of this reexamination.

The deputies who voted for the draft resolution written by the Yakovlev's commission worked to help the reactionaries at home and abroad, the enemies of Russia and socialism, whether they wanted to or not. But, the anti-communist and anti-Soviet elements must understand that the right to a final decision of such problems belongs to the people, the genuine protectors of the historical and

mental wealth of our strong socialist country. It is too early for them to rejoice. The counterrevolution and nationalism cannot go unpunished! The invincible union of free republics will be restored and consolidated by a great united Russia! The Soviet people have insisted and will continue to insist on this!

The crisis which had been engendered by the restorationist tendencies of perestroika and prevailed in the USSR, was mirrored in some countries of the socialist community. One day historians will call the year 1989 the darkest year in the history of the revolutionary international working class movement and communist movement, the year when socialism was frustrated totally in some European socialist countries and suffered a crisis and setback.

As for democracy, there is socialist democracy guaranteeing the interests of the working people and improving their working and living conditions, while there is bourgeois democracy which is used by the rich to dominate the poor, by the exploiting class to dominate the exploited, and by oppressors to dominate the oppressed. Betrayers reverse such a concept. But their manoeuvres will be exposed by the people sooner or later. From the viewpoint of the revolution, the capitalization of socialism assumes a counterrevolutionary character regardless of the shape of socialism and the form of the device used by the "proposers" and "designers". This is what Gorbachev, Yakovlev and Shebardnadze have done.

Though capitalism, its market economy, its values and its means and methods of solving social problems are not completely worthless from the viewpoint of all humanity, they cannot be a way to overcome the present difficulties facing socialism and its errors of the past and present. We face difficulties not only because we have made mistakes and are following an untrodden path, but also because the imperialists are conducting subversive activities constantly using their more developed economic and political methods. This is explained by the fact that the imperialists are trying to monopolize all the wealth of the world and the latest techniques by the "peaceful" plunder of subordinate nations, exploit the cheap manpower and natural resources of these countries and extract "wisdom" from the socialist and developing countries.

Since 1917 the imperialist struggle against socialism has been changed and modified constantly. The plan for this struggle has never disappeared from the table of the governments and the general staff of the capitalist countries. Since the socialist states came into being, most of these countries have experienced the enemy's attempts to frustrate socialism. In every incident, the reactionaries at home and abroad have achieved admirable unity in their action. As history and the recent incidents show, the counterrevolutionary forces drew lessons from their failure, but those who defeated the restorationists were intoxicated with the joy of victory instead of drawing a lesson.

The special feature of the present crisis facing socialism in Europe is that the Soviet Union, the strongest and most influential country in the socialist community, is confronted with a crisis. Everybody knows what effect our crisis will have on the events in the European socialist countries. The reform from socialism into capitalism in the USSR was welcomed by Hungary and Poland, but the socialist countries observed the process of this reform from socialism to capitalism cooly and with unease. The German Democratic Republic went so far as to ban the sale of our disgusting "yellow" publications. I do not think that such careful behaviour was welcomed by our "architects". Publications expressed unease. The reactionaries at home and abroad who understood clearly which direction democracy and glasnost being advertised in the USSR will follow cannot remain indifferent to such matters.

In the November and December events in Bulgaria, the GDR, Romania and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the objective mechanism of social imitation working in the revolutionary process and counterrevolutionary process began to work. The reformists and "revolutionaries" carried out a "mass rally"-style coup d'etat and used egoism and the young people's ambitions to meet their demands. They also used the words "humanitarian" and "democratic socialism, the appeal for "freedom from slave status", the ambition for power on the part of the elite intellectuals who were dissatisfied with their life under socialism, the demand to remove the working class from the leadership and, moreover, the proposal to dissolve the Marxist-Leninist parties. The anti-communist, anti-Soviet propaganda, the requirement for a non-socialist multi-party system, the removal of the Marxist-Leninist idea and the symbols of revolutionary proletariat from the mental life, and the abolition and destruction of the organs of State security which most consistently maintained the class stand, became omnipresent. The overthrown leadership was accused of a failure to follow the perestroika idea in the USSR.

Let me cite a complicated example. I have never praised the aristocratism and luxurious life of Ceausesku and other leaders of Romania and the worship of him. But it is necessary to remember that the coup d'etat took place in Romania, when Romania had increased industrial production by 20 per cent, paid back 20,000 million dollars of foreign debt, raised the lowest salary 3.3 times and reduced the difference between the highest and the lowest salaries to 3 to 4.7 (*Komsomol Pravda,* November 15, 1989). The "accidental coup" took place immediately after Ceausesku said, at the October plenary meeting of the Romanian Communist Party, that the country which introduced the "market economy" would naturally face inflation, an increase in fraud and a decline in living standards. He said that this would weaken the socialist position in the world and open the way for the restoration of capitalism. Ceausesku considered on the basis of these grounds, that the leadership role of the

communist parties had been eradicated in Hungary and Poland because they introduced the "market economy". He appreciated this as surrender before difficulties. In order to improve the situation he proposed to convene a consultative meeting of leaders of socialist countries and discuss the crisis prevailing in the socialist community. After a month, Nikolae and Elena Ceausesku were executed after a trial without any preliminary examination.

After taking power the "revolutionaries" banned the activities of the communist party, hastened to hold talks with King Mikhai through the princesses and tried to stimulate the oppressive political structures. The "revolutionaries" and reformists are trying to indict Erich Honecker, who was a prisoner in the Hitler era, as well as the leaders of other socialist countries and, what is worse, their indictments are similar. Everyone knows that the victorious counterrevolutionaries will retaliate and fabricate indictments. We "Leninists" totally ignored international solidarity! All the reformists have done is for the success of the "market economy".

The frustration of socialism in Eastern Europe brought the international working – class movement and communist movement to a crisis. The workers who oppose capital say that the social democrats betrayed them first and the communists are doing so now.

In the final analysis, this poses a question. If the reformation in European socialist countries assumed a revolutionary character, the character of socialist renewal and development, why were such reforms welcomed by Bush, Thatcher, Kohl, Mitterand and other capitalist leaders? From when did the capitalists begin to welcome revolution? For example, President Bush said in a statement that he was the main supporter of perestroika in socialist countries. And how can we explain the fact that he praised the "designers" of perestroika highly and expressed great concern for their health and success? The events in Eastern Europe show that crisis in the socialist countries was caused by the ruling parties having degenerated into anti-Leninism, I think. Because their leading cadres weakened and degenerated, the Czechoslovak Communist Party, the German Socialist Unity Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Romanian Communist Party and the Polish United Workers' Party were not able to overcome the strong petty-bourgeois wind, but drifted towards social democracy (Menshevism) and national communism.

The ideological breakdown of the CPSU, too, created a serious crisis. Objectively our party is not a union of people sharing the same idea. Differences in ideology are breaking up party organizations and structures. Confusion and vacillation have reached an extreme. The petty-bourgeoisie rejected by history—the Mensheviks, anarchists-syndicalists, national communists and Trotskyites have revived and are working now in the CPSU. Criticism and self-criticism were replaced by bourgeois pluralism. The principle of

democratic centralism was ignored, party discipline was weakened, the withdrawal of members from the party became popular and the leadership and members of the party were separated from the Soviet people. The 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party took a decision to prevent the break-up of the party and secede from the CPSU. A week-long visit to Lithuania by Gorbachev, Medvedev and other members of the CPSU Central Committee failed to meet expectations and exposed the weakness of the compromising attitude of the leadership.

There have appeared some party members who consider that they have the right to conduct anti-socialist, anti-Soviet activities in the CPSU. Yu. Afanasiev and his followers like possessing a membership card, even though they openly oppose Marxism-Leninism. The party leadership is failing to counterattack the renegades, opportunists and those who are trying to break up the party. They try to form factions in the organization and have included this in the new programmes and rules of the party. Most party publications, the radio and the television which have been bribed by the revisionists and national communists do not reflect the interests of the working people and, instead, have spread bourgeois ideas and morals advocating "values for all humanity" and forged the history of the party and the Soviet state. The shortage of trustworthy communists in the party leadership and the passivity of party members break up the CPSU from within, destroy the political and organizational unity of the working people and leave the people in a defenceless state before those who are trying to restore capitalism on the national and world wide scale.

In order to save the CPSU from its crisis the revisionists proposed to eradicate the ideological and political unity of the party and eliminate democratic centralism from the party rules. For example, Beleckolis, a member of the Central Committee of the recently-founded Lithuanian Communist Party, suggested that anyone who purchased a membership card should be recognized as a party member. Even social democratic parties would not have conceived of selling or buying a membership card. A membership card is not necessary for the members of the party captivated by the "market relations", to say nothing of democratic centralism.

For whom is all this necessary? It is obvious that a party without democratic centralism will collapse before its first trial. Such a party is not a danger to anti-communism; it may be dissolved into the masses and become an appendage of blind political forces. Such a party may be infiltrated by the class enemy because it cannot work flexibly. That is why the Lithuanian national-communists decided to restore capitalism and withdraw from the Soviet Union. From this viewpoint I think that no persuasion is necessary. In my opinion the party organizations in Lithuania must be registered again and all those who are trying to break up the organization must be expelled

from the party.

It is now obvious for many people that the crisis in the CPSU makes it necessary to found a Russian Communist Party in the Russian Soviet Socialist Federated Republic. The revival of the RCP will strengthen the CPSU. But, such party of the soviet republic must not have the puppet bureau of RSFSR as confirmed by the December 1989 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, but their own central committee elected at their own congress. Only a party which is cleared of renegades, nationalists, Zionists and revisionists can build up a genuinely revolutionary Marxist-Leninist force throughout the country on the theoretical basis of scientific socialism. A congress of Russian communists must be convened at the earliest date before the election of the local Soviet governments. The Working People's United Front and other patriotic organizations which are compromising with the ruined group of Gorbachev, Yakovlev, Shebardnadze and Medvedev do not understand this fact. It is necessary to organize committees in support of Constituent Congress of the Russian Communist Party.

The December 30, 1989, issue of the newspaper *Soviet Russia* carried the basic programme for the socialist patriotic movement of Russia for the election. We wholeheartedly support all the items in this patriotic programme. But, we consider that this document must be supplemented with the proposal to found the Russian Communist Party and with the idea of the leading role of the Russian working class which hold a large majority. Without them any renewal of socialism is inconceivable.

In the final analysis, without the active participation of the working class who suffered damage through perestroika, no social renewal nor perestroika is possible. The counterrevolutionaries who know this fact are fighting one another to win over the working class, bribing them, dividing them according to nation and region, putting them under American-style trade unions and encouraging them in the "solidarity" movement. In this regard, we need to examine the visit to the United States by the trade union activists' group and strike committee members. Americans gave them a warm reception and allowed them to use the mass media, including publications and the television. Apparently, the Central Soviet of the All-Union Trade Unions is not aware of the fact that the struggle to win over the working class started at the political stage in our homeland. The very existence of the Central Soviet of the All-Union Trade Unions and more than that depend on the outcome of this struggle.

Frightened by the social pressure, the bureaucrats, advertizing "free zone" and private ownership, declared to the workers who were tired of a scarcity of supplies: "Which would you like? Socialism with poverty or capitalism with richness?" For socialism our grandfathers carried out the October Revolution in 1917 and our fathers defended its gains in the grave war, but they reject the

prospect of affluent socialism. From this viewpoint they employ a provocative slogan: "The Bolshevik Party has led the country to the present crisis ruling over 70 years." The party means the millions of CPSU members who have carried out and are conducting their duties correctly. Those who led the country to the crisis are revisionists in the leadership who have failed to find a solution to the problem of the renewal and development of socialism and caused many serious new troubles. None of the tasks put forward at the 27th Congress of the CPSU has been implemented. The CPSU Central Committee must demand the resignation of the Right opportunist group of Gorbachev and Yakovlev and build up a political bureau with leaders holding Marxist-Leninist and Soviet patriotic positions.

On January 15 this year Soviet people's deputies Sobchak and Popov appeared in the Leningrad TV programme "The Fifth Wheel". I fully support Sobchak's appreciation of the internal situation that "the prestige of the supreme leaders is falling". In my opinion this is in line with the reality. Contrary to this view, Professor Popov appealed to all the people to support Gorbachev more actively "than ever". As Mayakovski said, the prestige of any leader is not trousers. We should not support them in all cases, nor trust them blindly. I think that the people's deputies yet did not get rid of the outcomes of the Czarist idea that caused a lot of trouble in our country.

We should not judge political leaders by their speeches, appeals and good intentions, but by their activities and the results of their policies. I have already mentioned this. I would like to add to this the fact that no great decisions have been carried out in the past five years. The decisions which did not coincide with their interests were cancelled and some decisions were made belatedly. Such examples are the problems of Karabakh, Lithuania and Baku which damaged the prestige of the central power and aggravated the tension to the extreme.

Gorbachev, the present head of the party and state, is not able to adopt any measures, so it is absurd to say that no one can take his place, I think.

Firstly, there have been and there will be people who can take his place. Secondly, such an assertion is ridiculous in such a country as Russia which has many able, well-seasoned and creative people. I think that there are such people among the members of the CPSU Central Committee. Thirdly, the time has come when we should switch over to true collective leadership in which different important posts are not concentrated on one man. Why can we not organize a council of secretaries of the central committee and introduce a system under which members of the political bureau act as chairman on a rotary basis. This will make it possible to increase due consideration, a sense of responsibility and maturity in finding a solution to political problems.

The revisionists and renegades who laid all the blame on "Stalinism" and placed our country in a dilemma now enjoy prestige before their imperialist supporters. They say that there is no alternative to the restorationist way of perestroika. This is a lie. Abalkin, Popov, Shmelev, Zaslavskaya, Tsikhonov and our other inviolable economists monopolized the whole of economic science and all publications a long time ago and did not allow their opponents to take part in these activities. We demand that party organizations and their editorial boards open alternative opinions and proposals to the public through party and scientific publications. We also demand that they inform the public of the increasing dissatisfaction of the working people with the present perestroika policy.

During the election of Soviet people's deputies, in some places "The People's Front", "The Democratic Union", "Memorial" and other forces for the restoration of capitalism won by employing cheap false propaganda, groundless promises to voters and slander against the candidates who were not in their favour. But, as a result of this victory by the restorationists, the workers held 18 per cent of seats and the kolkhozniks who account for three quarters of the country's population held a trifling minority. As a result, the Supreme Soviet congress and regular meetings have been converted into an "all-union booth" where the Cabinet members stayed for several weeks and months, stopping their work , and listened to ceaseless eloquence and grumbles of elected people. This reduced the effectiveness of passing bills to the lowest level.

It was noticeable that the number of local Soviet deputies of working class origin decreased by half. Apathy and tiresomeness of residents toward the election campaigns by eloquent speakers were observed. The voters' meetings often come to an abortive end. In this situation, patriotic organizations must make every possible effort to nominate as many candidates as possible from enterprises, kolkhozy and sovkhozy. "The leaders of perestroika" now feel uneasy and we should take advantage of this so that as less demagogues, empty promisers, and adventurers should not be permitted to be elected, if possible. Even the government organs of socialist republics and regions must include as many true working people and open-hearted, modest and reliable people as possible. All these organizations must support our candidates, cooperating with the trade unions in the election campaign.

With a view to abolishing socialism, "the leaders of perestroika" are trying to establish a "professional parliament" recruited from four per cent of activists, and consisting of "the intellect of the nation," that is, academicians, lawyers, journalists and other high-level intellectuals. If we consider that there are 76 intellectuals for every 1,000 Russians, 52 for every 1,000 Ukrainians and 434 for every 1,000 Jews according to recent data, it will be obvious who will be the ruler.

A "professional parliament" and the "intellect of the nation"—these phrases express the craftiness of Zionism which is trying to seize power in our country. Therefore, we must support the patriotic workers' demand for the power of representation for each nation within government organs, the academy of sciences, the writers' union and other organizations. Only this will guarantee genuine equality for different races and minority nations.

That is why we must not weaken the ideological offensive against those who are trying to capitalize socialism, whatever mask they may wear. No one of their sallies through the mass media should be left without answer.

Before long a plebiscite will be launched relating to the ownership problem and other essential problems. We must intensify our activity where it is possible to break through to the press.

We should put aside all disputes and all things which may divide us. We must understand that these are trifling things compared with the danger our socialist fatherland is now facing. In concluding his speech at the memorial service for international soldiers who fell in battle in Africa, Fidel Castro declared on behalf of the communists and ordinary people: "Socialism or death!"** Now supporting this slogan is an urgent task for the Soviet people, too.

(Published for the first time)

* The report entitled "Let Us Prevent the Socialist Fatherland from Being Driven to Catastrophe" was delivered by N.A. Andreyeva at the All-Union seminar which was held in Moscow on January 24, 1990 on the theme "Perestroika and Increase of the Political Activity of the Working People".

** Making a speech at the mourning meeting which was held in Cacahual on December 7, 1989, Fidel Castro Ruz said: "We, Cuban communists and millions of revolutionary fighters who constitute a heroic and revolutionary people, can play the role which history has assigned to us, not only as the representatives of the first socialist state in the Western Hemisphere, but also as the unbending defenders who are fighting in the vanguard of the noble cause of all poor and oppressed people.

We never strove to become the keepers of the glorious banners and principles which the revolutionary movement has skilfully upheld in the whole period of its glorious and heroic history. However, if we, as the fate has willed it, should one day remain among the last defenders of socialism in the universe, in which the empire of evil would succeed in realizing the Hitlerite dreams of world supremacy, we would be able to defend this stronghold to the last drop of our blood." (Fidel Castro, *Cuba's Choice Is Socialism*, Jose Marti Publishing House, Havana, 1990, p. 64).

* * *

WHAT FORM OF PERESTROIKA DO WE SUPPORT?

Talk with V. Saranchev, Correspondent of *Soviet Patriot*

There was quite a lot of criticisms levelled at you. What is your attitude to the article published in Soviet Russia *in the light of today's situation?*

—I can say that my article, *I Cannot Give Up Principles* was the result of prolonged meditation and argument and of my previous endeavour to have my opinions published. I don't agree with the assertion that it is a "manifesto for the anti-perestroika forces". Did I really call for the abolition of Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution and instigate the workers to strike and create national discord? Did I really call for republics to leave the USSR and for the communist parties of the republics to break with the Soviet Communist Party? Did I really call for the restoration of capitalism and the conversion of all-people property into private property? Did I encourage the spread of immorality in life and art and slander our armed forces? No, I did not. So why did most of the press concentrate their attack on me with the help of "pluralism" branding my opinion as "Stalinism", "anti-Semitism" and other chimeras of diseased imagination? In fact, there is nothing about notorious "Stalinism" or "anti-Semitism" in my article.

—Why then did you not reply? As Ogonyok *reported, you refused to speak to reporters.*

—The point is that all those who, beg your pardon, spat in my face never tried to meet me or even see how ill-natured this Andreyeva was. I have tried to have my opinions about the articles speaking ill of me published, but they have neither printed them nor replied to me.

Nothing has changed even though the resolution on glasnost was adopted at the 19th Party Conference. Maybe, they wanted to prove that the truth today is on the side of the people who have large circulation.

As is known, perestroika our people greeted with delight revealed two different approaches as early as the summer of 1987 which at first manifested themselves mainly in appreciating the past of our Soviet. M.S. Gorbachev's jubilee report was aimed to remove these distinctions and reduce the passion of the dispute. But the contradictions only became more acute. My letter to *Soviet Russia* and an article carried in *Pravda* dated April 5, 1988, which was a reply to my letter, revealed these contradictions and identified the two tendencies in perestroika, socialist and restorationist ones. Around the spring of 1989 difference between these tendencies became so pointed that they became opposite to each other.

We all support perestroika. The problem is what form of perestroika we support. I support socialist tendency, but I am opposed to restorative tendency. Herein lies the essence of the acute contradictions in our society today. The restoration of capitalism cannot be tolerated.

I believe that it is the serious patriotic duty of everyone to support socialist perestroika and to counter the capitalist restorationists in our country and their political and ideological structures.

—You talked about patriotic duty. But, the word "patriot" has

disappeared from the vocabulary of many party workers and those in charge of ideological affairs. In our times to call oneself patriot seems to have become not prestigious.

You are correct. The prevailing situation now does not require any illustration or confirmation, because it is clear. What is more important is to put the question of why such things happened in the fifth year of perestroika which, unfortunately, had aroused not only the political activity of the masses, but also, in a number of cases, assumed anything but constructive character to this activity.

For us patriotism was always connected with national consciousness and statehood and with the October Revolution which allowed the Russian people to emerge in the "red corner of history", as Alexei Tolstoy wrote. In the long run, Soviet patriotism for the working people has never had an abstract and Manilov-style ostentatious character. Soviet patriotism has nothing to do with the blood-curdling effusion of love of the great power "occupied" by black forces for 70 years, with tearing off the shirt to show the crosses carried on the body or with other acting for show. It manifests itself not in word but in deed, moreover, in work, service, study and social activities every day. In my opinion, socialist patriotism is the needle of compass in people's minds indicating always the direction of the interests of the working people in their own country, the interests of the community of socialist states and the interests of the people that are being freed from imperialism and colonial subordination.

For each person the fatherland cannot be sold or bought or chosen or changed or bestowed. Filial feeling to the fatherland is kept in the minds of people all their life. It is not a conditional concept which may give way to the pretensions of "creative individuals" who try to seek their "happiness" in a foreign country. I hate those who seek an "earthly paradise", deceived by the persistence and cunning tricks of others in a critical situation. As the Russian people have done on many occasions over thousands of years, they should defend their fatherland in this critical situation, even sacrificing themselves.

A "cosmopolitan citizen" or a neophyte of the "European house" cannot deserve respect, for he hurries to make use of his profession, say, as a programmer, which was obtained in the Soviet "home", where it is now paid more, having carelessly forgotten that his professional training on the world standard cost the people 200,000 dollars. Nor can I respect people of culture who have built houses in Vienna or villas on the Azure Coast with their earnings and hastily send their whole family there to be "out of harm's way". Soviet patriotism is incompatible with nationalism or cosmopolitanism, however they are camouflaged.

Love for the fatherland transcends hatred and is free from animosity. It is inevitably accompanied by resistance to evil and contempt for the enemy of socialism, and for the restorationists of capi-

talist relations and the nationalists who burnt our state flags and the uniforms of the Soviet Army in the face of the people and destroyed the monuments to the fallen soldiers. How should we treat those who gather at the tombs of the hangmen of the legions of the SS to memory of the vicious stooges of the "Latvian legion of the SS" and the 20th Estonian Division of the SS, their hands stained with the blood of Pskov and Byelorussian peasants? And how should we treat those who glorify the traitors, Vlasovites and Banderovites and the vampires from the band of "forest brothers", who, demonstrating or fasting, demand special treatment as participants in the Great Patriotic War, and those who propagate their reverence for Adolf Hitler through the television, talking about their fascist "ideals"?

But they proclaim all as "revolution"(!) to us and cover it up with the name of perestroika. Isn't this "new thought" which, being developed by the "democratic" mass media, deliberately erodes socialist patriotism?

How many people are there who call Russia a "bitch" and advocate that their fatherland is a place where they are paid more?

There are also many people who make a success of their life by speaking ill of the fatherland, people who have turned against the October Revolution and Lenin in the complicated period of perestroika, people who untwist the fly-wheel of the "shady economy" and feed up the "leaders" of the organized criminality and those who implant immorality and anti-patriotism. How can we ignore what they are doing? How can we tolerate the assertion that the feeling of patriotism is outdated, unnecessary and ineffective?

Invigorating socialist patriotism is now direly needed in the grave crisis our country is facing. Therefore, in my opinion, decisive action should be taken against any remoulding of patriotic consciousness. Otherwise, we will fail to defend socialist transformations and to repulse the challenge of the attempted restoration by anti-communist elements and traitors.

—In a comment in Pravda *it is asserted that you do not believe in our young people. How much is it well-founded? Being a lecturer you are always with students. So you have a good opportunity to compare the young people of the present times with those when you were a student. Who emerges from the comparison better?*

—Older generations like to compare the days of their youth with those of the young people of the present times. The result is not, as a rule, in favour of the young people of the present times. I do not want to commit such an error. In the early days, Marx said that if children are less clever than their parents, social progress will cease. I am always lucky with students, I think. Most of the students, male and female, whom I teach are modest and serious. When comparing them with my classmates, they are more developed intellectually, are stronger in their sense of self-respect and open in their emotions. They are characterized, in most cases, by a wide range of interests

and by high exactingness and are more independent in their judgement and action.

The students of the present times, however, have no strong sense of duty and are less industrious. They are somewhat "overfed" by information, are spoilt and have less sense of responsibility for their actions. They also have no spirit of overcoming trials and difficulties and are strongly infected with the spirit of living at the expense of others. Let me take an example. Most of my classmates lived on their scholarships and, after school, earned money to live. Moreover, most of us were democratic and patriotic and were ready to help our comrades who were in difficulties.

Now we pay much attention to our past and liquidate the "white spots" in history. It is not difficult to notice that most of our achievements are doubted under the pretext of restoring truth. Moreover, V. Kostikov, in an article titled "Patent leather topboots" in Ogonyok *No. 32 for 1989, actually already accused the October Revolution of lack of democracy, in other words, of the failure of the revolutionary scheme. Some publicists, in revising our history, are trying to persuade readers that there was no Trotskyism as such in our country and that Trotsky himself was a genius and an unfortunate victim to Stalinism. Furthermore, the accusation levelled at Lenin is already heard, say, Lenin demanded that one must be cruel and ruthless to one's enemy and Stalin only carried forward his cause.*

The present is the offspring of the past and the mother of the future. Discrediting parents and people of older generations has always a harmful role in both the family and human society. So, who benefits from vilifying the past of our revolution? Who has dared to try to benefit ideologically and politically from it? Why to convert the "white spots" in the Soviet history into a completely "dark period"? They are not painless problems. Isn't history the basis of patriotism, including socialist patriotism?

In fact the anti-Stalin campaign is now becoming an anti-communist and anti-Leninist campaign. Anti-Stalinism alone was not enough. Because there remained Lenin and the October Revolution that marked the zenith of the history of our country. Today the fashionable subject is "Stalinism". Monographs, newspaper articles, TV and films are devoted to it. I think it would be more useful to consider and analyse the consequences of anti-Stalinism, for anti-Stalinism has done more harm to our country and the international communist movement than the consequences of personality cult taken together. But this is a special theme.

Every manner of slur is being made against V.I. Lenin. For example, the famous dramatist Gabrilovich, in the *Literary Newspaper*, rightly protested against embellishment and iconolatry in the portrayal of Lenin but laid stress not on the logic and integrity of Lenin's words and deeds but on the notorious "complexity, contra-

dictions and intolerance of anyone who did not agree with him. Sympathizers of Gabrilovich accuse Lenin of repression and cruelty, considering his activities apart from the epoch of the acutest class struggle. Let me refer to Lenin himself. "I judge soberly and categorically," he said, "which is better, imprisoning tens or hundreds of agitators, whether guilty or innocent, whether conscious or not, or losing thousands of Red Army soldiers and workers? The first is better. Let people accuse me of any mortal offences and violation of freedom. I admit I am guilty but the interests of the workers will gain." (V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 295.)

How would we have acted? Would we have taken the option of sacrificing thousands of workers and Red Army soldiers?

It is evident that the anti-Leninists are taking us away from the main thing in Lenin, whose each thought, in the words of Gorky, was always turned in the direction of the class interests of the proletariat and all the working people. How far we are now from Lenin!

As far as history is concerned, I think that it will not be long before young readers will be finally sick of the widely advertised "masterpieces" dazzling with hatred which were written by pseudo-historians. In the long run, they did not mention what superhuman efforts it cost the country in the 15 years before the war to make progress that would normally have taken a century and what made the "slaves of Stalinism" save humanity from the fate of vanishing as smoke in the ovens of O'swiecim and Midanek. The high intellectual level and increasing enthusiasm of the Soviet people, particularly of the young people, will allow, first of all, in my opinion, many of them to go from swallowing the timeserving articles, compilations and the commentator's elucidation of our past over to the study of and acquaintance with the originals of Lenin, Stalin, Ordzhonikidze, Molotov, Kalinin, Kirov, Frunze, Kuibyshev, as well as with the works of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Preobrazhensky and other authors which have been transferred from the special storehouses. This will allow everyone to rid themselves of the cliches of the "new" publications and draw their own conclusions on the question of "who is who".

The awakened attention to Trotsky has not purely scientific character, because Trotskyism was the antipode of Leninism for more than 30 years, whatever the neo-Trotskyists may try to suggest us. This is not merely a problem about "revolutionary punishment" meted out against the participants in the revolution. Many articles have been written about this. Let me talk about Trotsky's viewpoint on patriotism. He branded patriotism as bourgeois and opposed it because in his opinion there is no fatherland for the proletariat, their fatherland being the world. Trotsky always infused this idea into his readers' and audiences' minds.

Lev Davidovich neither liked anything national, which meant for him something inferior, archaic and backward. He counterpoised to

things national things international which are interpreted as unnatural in the cosmopolitan spirit. In characterizing the Russian people who, according to him, are wanting in culture he gave much preference to things national. Russia, he said, merely did what was taught by Varangians, Swedes and Germans—Knop, Uz and Rothschild and stock jobbing genius and "Viking of all Vikings—great internationalist Mendelson". In his pamphlet *Political Silhouette* he has given a whole gallery of such "internationalists" from Schuster and Kautsky to Glazman, the personal stenographer of the people's commissar of naval forces.

Whatever people may say, I consider that the great exploit performed by the party leadership after the death of Lenin was that it neutralized Trotsky and defeated Trotskyism which threatened to cause great disasters in the country. I feel inclined to share the opinion of many workers and communists of those days that Stalin had committed an error and allowed Trotsky to leave the country and take with him enormous archives, "confiscated" historic treasures and works of art giving him travelling allowance in foreign currency and the Soviet passport, which he used more than two years.

The intrigue activity of Trotsky continued until 1940, killing many innocent people. Therefore, calling him an "unfortunate victim of Stalinism" means, at least, mockery of historical facts.

David Ramnick mentioned the "Unity" group. What is this group? Who are members of this group?

The All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" was founded in Moscow in May 1989. Admitted to it are citizens of the USSR who are over 16 years old, irrespective of party affiliation, nationality, religious belief, social status and duty. As stipulated in its rules, it unites all those who are concerned about the critical situation created in the country. It sees in the communist party cleared of renegades, bureaucrats and revisionists the main guarantee and unique socio-political force capable of leading the restoration of socialism, imparting dynamic and stable character to its development and dealing counterblows to the anti-socialist forces at home and abroad. The ideological base of the society is Marxism-Leninism, a scientific, revolutionary and perfect theory for the international working class and all socialist forces of the present times.

But I was surprised to read the information in *Veteran* No. 49 by A. Komarakov, a *TASS* correspondent, who without hesitation asserted that "Unity" calls for dictatorship as an inalienable part of the class struggle and spreads the image of internal and external enemy without which "the struggle for socialism is impossible".

As far as the enemies of socialism are concerned, it is not necessary to seek them either at home or abroad, because they are before our eyes. The enemies are the guardsmen of the "shady economy", members of cooperative—the new riches, the new-born "Soviet bourgeois" and the "fattened tomcats" of underground business.

They shout "Let us beat communism with perestroika," "Party, change course!" and, more openly, "Down with the Soviet Communist Party" at meetings and demonstrations. Doesn't Komrakov regard such people as active forces of perestroika? Where did this *TASS* correspondent collect his material on the establishment of a dictatorship?

The members of "Unity" take an active part in the work of socialist transformation, the elimination of unfair practices in life, rebuff to anti-communism and nationalism and to the attempt at moral decomposition of society.

The talk was held in this way. Of course, not everything in the statements of Nina Alexandrovna is unquestionable. One may not agree with her on some questions and argue with her. I think that the readers themselves will determine their attitude with respect to her principles. Life demands that everyone should know clearly his or her place in the struggle for the renovation of our country and for perestroika.

One thing that is undoubted and calls forth involuntary respect is the sincere anxiety of N. Andreyeva for the situation created in our country, and her endeavour not to sit out in a nook, waiting for what will happen in future, but to exert an active influence on the course of the events herself.

Her viewpoint surely differs from that of others. Let us think of how long all of us have had a single viewpoint on everything that is happening around us—as we were told "from the top". And we know well what it has resulted in. Truth is born in arguments. But let this argument not be fruitless.

Soviet Patriot
No. 2 for 1990, pp. 11-13

* * *

On April 14-15, 1990 in Moscow there was held the second conference of the society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" which discussed the situation in the CPSU and the country, problems of further perfecting the activity and structure of the organization, its financial situation, preparation for the 28th Congress of the CPSU and working out of the rules, programme and instructions as to the formation of primary organizations and leading organs of the society.

Chairman of the coordinating council N. A. Andreyeva delivered report at the conference.

The resolution adopted at the conference pointed out that reorganization of the All-Union Society "Unity" is to be effected depending on the result of the 28th Congress of the CPSU:

"a) To set to organize the party of Leninist Bolshevik type with the corresponding society under it in case of the split of the CPSU at the congress and when the bourgeois multiparty system is established. The name of the party is to be decided on in the course of discussion on the spots and at the constituent congress.

"b) If the split of the CPSU does not take place and the turn to Bolshevism is effected, to prepare for and effect conversion of "Unity" as the independent society into the politicized organization functioning on the basis of democratic centralism."

REPORT TO THE SECOND ALL-UNION CONFERENCE OF THE SOCIETY "UNITY FOR LENINISM AND COMMUNIST IDEALS"

April 14, 1990, Moscow

Dear comrades,

Today we have gathered at our Second All-Union Conference, in order to discuss the situation prevailing in the country and the work of our society "Unity" and define the tasks facing us as a social and political organization. About eleven months ago, when we gathered at the Constituent Conference, we little knew each other and about our possibilities and practically had no experience in influencing the processes proceeding in the country. Much has changed during this short period of time. The basic ideas have been filtered, definite methods of work of "Unity" have taken shape in different regions, and certain demarcation has been drawn among the comrades taking part in our movement.

All this requires collective comprehension and discussion, exchange of the experience in work and specification of the tasks confronting us. Commemorating the present meeting the thesis *On the Current Moment* * was prepared and sent round to more than 100 addresses. The Five-Year Plan of perestroika has been completed now, the first Five-Year Plan in the USSR, which evidently assumed a critical character and by this radically differed not only from the Stalinist Five-Year Plans, but also from those of the stagnant period. In two months the 28th Congress of the CPSU, which is called upon to determine the destiny of the party and the country, will be held.

There is no need to speak here about the numerous manifestations of the present crisis which has been caused by the anti-popular, counterrevolutionary tendency in perestroika. The crisis which has created direct threat to the basic achievements and put the fundamental basis of socialism on the brink of liquidation.

The Right-opportunist leadership has made the country face the destruction of socialist society, the Soviet state and the communist party. I think that now we have the right to say about the beginning of the second decisive stage of counterrevolution, which may result in reducing the USSR to a source of raw materials and a semi-colony of America, the NATO and Japanese imperialism.

Academicians Shatalin and Petrakov, the closest economic advisers to the President, and others insist on immediately reforming the prices of the basic food products, which then will rise two to

three times and throw off more than 100 million of our compatriots into abject poverty, and will make 10-15 million people jobless. And it is asserted that all this is "in the name of man's welfare".

Apparently in this concrete case, too, those revisionists who have come to the leadership again attribute their complete unsoundness and lack of talent to J.V. Stalin who died 37 years ago and to the notorious "commanding-bureaucratic system".

What are the characteristic features of the present stage of restoration of capitalism in the USSR?

I. The Aggravation of the Crisis and Its Causes

First, the restoration process of the capitalization of socialism came to the surface of social phenomena and showed itself in all spheres of economic activity. As a result of this the Soviet people have found themselves in the grip of the so-called "shady economy", home-bred Soviet millionaires, cooperative and other robbers and speculators, and of the increasing organizational crimes.

Democracy, glasnost and pluralism on which praises were showered, called into being not only militia clubs, special units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the proclamation of the state of emergency and "special boards of administration", but also compelled the Soviet people to pay with hundreds of the killed, thousands of the crippled and hundreds of thousands of refugees from their native places. And this was at a peacetime!

It is not accidental that the "architects" and "superintendents" of perestroika have stopped prophesying about the "light at the end of the tunnel" and declare that the peak of the crisis will come in 1991.

Secondly, the restoration of capitalism in the USSR is going under powerful ideological and political cover. Through mass media the renegades conducted a powerful anti-communist campaign which assumed the character and form of anti-Stalin hysteria. One of the aims of this campaign was preliminary vilification of the most heroic and successful stages of the development of the Soviet state in order to paralyse any resistance of Soviet people.

A huge avalanche torrent of dirty and slanderous speeches, the ideological epicentre of which was, in the final analysis, anti-communism, was formed. The timeservers in sociology, philosophy, political economy and historical science started to vie with the radio stations of "Freedom", "Free Europe", the "Voice of Israel" and other foreign propaganda centres of imperialism in belittling and vulgarizing the historic contribution of socialism to the world civilization with a view to rescuing mankind from fascist plague.

As a result of this ideological campaign the Soviet people found themselves in compact ideological captivity, substantially unarmed ideologically and incapable of putting up effective resistance to the capitalization of socialism. In particular, the Soviet young people

found themselves in a difficult situation, being corrupted by pornography, narcotism, alcoholism, and the Western mass culture, which inculcated the cult of unlimited power, profit and violence on them. Our young people are deprived of ideals, that is, the future.

Thirdly, the main means and condition of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR are the premeditation of the organization of a really dangerous crisis by the "pioneers". Subjected to destruction is everything that has been created by the Soviet people for 70 years after the October Revolution: from social production to the superstructure of the society—morals and ideology. The aim of this premeditated destruction is to instigate the Soviet people to refuse socialism and return the country to the capitalist path.

Fourthly, at present the political formation of the second stage of the restoration of capitalism has started. Thrown into the game of rival political forces, the Soviets are being turned into the organs for direct reactionary overturn.

The introduction of the presidential administration means actual undermining of the power of the Soviets, the very power which was won by the working people in October 1917, and was consolidated during the period of transition from capitalism to the building of foundations of socialism in the USSR. The legislators have forgotten that the people have not handed over to anybody the mandate for the presidential change in the political superstructure of socialist society. This problem can be solved only by means of a nationwide referendum. It has been again confirmed in practice that if a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is needed for the transition from capitalism to socialism, then the withdrawal from socialism to capitalism is impossible without the dictatorship of the neo-bourgeoisie, the kings of the shady economy, who have accreted with the bribed bureaucracy and elite intelligentsia. Namely for them the authoritarianism of the presidency has turned out to be most preferable. As Deputy Chobanu declared, "In order to correct the situation, we again need a tsar, no matter how he is called." It is characteristic that the presidential council, according to Gorbachev, includes only his supporters and those who are devoted to him. This council is called upon to replace the Political Bureau in the near future and thereby free the President from political control and principled criticism.

The ruling circles of imperialist powers, ardent supporters of perestroika, have taken part directly or indirectly in the capitalization of socialism in the USSR. It is not accidental that foreign press compares the meeting at Malta, following which certain events started in East Europe, with the prewar Munich Agreement. There arose the threat of the enslavement of the Soviet people, the same as was prepared by the Stalinist leadership in the years of the Second World War.

Finally, one of the peculiarities of the present counterrevolution is its social-democratic cover. Today the renegades and capitulators

fear to call capitalism as it is in reality. They pharisaically call it socialism with a human face, democratic socialism, qualifying our socialism built in battles as being "regimented", "feudal", "bureaucratic" and so on. Of course, they keep silent about the fact that the abused socialist system allowed them to become academicians, professors, laureates and generals.

The party leadership of perestroika and its representatives in the provinces oppose till now the registration of our "Unity", at the same time creating favourable conditions for the formation of bourgeois parties, to which the state power is gradually being handed over. Under the cover of demagogy for perestroika, these parties openly take part in the political struggle for power, and attack socialism destroyed by capitulators. In this they refused right away to compete and cooperate with the communists, on which the authors of the Platform of the CC of the CPSU to be submitted to the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party had pinned hopes. Already now the threats, "Put the communists outside the law!" are sounded.

Leaflets with an appeal "Put the communists on the gallows!" are being spread. Judging by all the indications, the forces hostile to socialism have begun preparations for the open destruction of the party committees, of state security services and of the organs for maintaining public order.

Sixthly, one of the decisive directions of the restoration of capitalism is bourgeois nationalism. For the first time in the history of the USSR the problem of disintegrating our multinational power has been raised so impudently. The real causes for inter-national antagonisms should not be sought in the so-called mistakes of Leninist national policy which has established in our country the friendship of the peoples and the fraternal relations of mutual assistance.

Socialism became an obstacle namely for the reviving national bourgeoisie and the national intelligentsia serving them, on their way to their greedy desires, to their aspirations for gain and to their adventurous intrigue. The spread of nationalism and separatism was promoted by the utterances of A.N. Yakovlev and other leaders of perestroika, who flirted with the "national fronts" and called the Baltic republics the citadel and showcase of perestroika.

It should be stressed that the separation of the republics from the USSR is not aimed at the renovation and consolidation of socialism in these republics, but at the conversion of the socialist republics into bourgeois states with all ensuing consequences affecting the working people.

In the lap of the present perestroika the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic was the first to start the competition in the restoration of bourgeois order. There they not only started to pay the compensation for the confiscation of the property of the former bourgeoisie and the fawners of Hitler, but also declared the "privatization" of state own-

ership in the implements and means of production. In other words, they declared the denationalization of industry, i.e., its transfer to private hands. The new owners are to become the pillars of the "independent Lithuania". Estonia and Georgia where socialist property has been taken stock of, are taking that very road. These actions are accompanied by political provocations and excesses.

I would like to cite one fact which testifies that degeneration in our country went extremely deep. The Tbilisi Mensheviks who came to Batumi on March 18, wearing bulletproof vests and armed with automatic rifles, amid hollers of their several hundred local like-minded people, pulled down a monument of Lenin from the pedestal which was in front of the office of the regional committee of the CPSU at the central square of the city. The sculpture was destroyed in the presence of the "fathers" of the city, the Minister of Internal Affairs, and the secretaries of the regional party committee. They rolled the head of the sculpture up to the feet of the party leadership of Adzhar, spat at it, urinated on it, and they themselves quietly left for Tbilisi. At the command of the Party Central Committee and the government of Georgia the militia and the military unit disposed nearby did not interfere in it in order to prevent the act of vandalism and profanation. It is difficult to suppose that this disgraceful noninterference was not sanctioned by Moscow. In the *Literary Newspaper* and in other "yellow" press, the authors only complained that this did not happen to those monuments of Stalin which remained in Georgia.

Apparently, it is not accidental that in the Western countries and also in Turkey and Iran the descendants of the "one-time" exploiters and parasites who were chucked out at one time, take out the certificates of their forfeited movables and immovables: plots of land, estates, homes and so on. They are convinced that soon they will be able to produce their certificates to the working people in the future "independent states" which will come into being in place of the union republics.

If we analyse it, the secession of a Soviet republic from the USSR assumes social and class character rather than national character, something which considerable strata of the population do not understand for the time being. And it is necessary to get the population understand that the anti-socialist forces are realizing their plot. And explaining this is one of the most important tasks of our All-Union Society "Unity". For this it is necessary to act jointly with the international fronts, with the "Union", a group of deputies, and with other patriotic organizations and societies.

Seventhly, it seems that the regional cost-accounting system and self-financing advertised by the "architects" of perestroika will lead not only national republics but also other regions of the country to a "competition" in the capitalization of socialism. It is not accidental that the press writes a lot about the provincial, municipal and region-

al egoism. This is the result of the undermining of the basic law the systematic character of functioning and development of economy. Market economy means the spread of localism and egoism.

Eighthly, the restoration of capitalism in the USSR directly affected the countries of socialist commonwealth where the retreat from socialism, as well as its weakening and crisis have taken place. The dismantling of socialism in East Europe intensifies in its turn the restorationist tendencies in the USSR.

The irresponsibility, weakness and petty-bourgeois degeneration of the leadership in the East European states and Mongolia, the reinforcement of the revisionist and Right-opportunist strata in the ruling parties, and also the depoliticization, dissociation and misinformation of the working people which were increased in the stagnant period, the economic difficulties, and the incapability of the party-state leadership to cope with these difficulties in proper time were utilized by the internal and external anti-socialist forces. These forces turned the legitimate discontent of the peoples in the direction of anti-communism, anti-Sovietism, Russophobia and the restoration of capitalism.

These "popular" revolutions did not take place in socialist countries accidentally at all, as the press seized by the revisionists is trying to convince us. They were prepared well beforehand and were coordinated in time, and the Western analysts are not ashamed of confirming this. In each country there was strict coordination of actions of external political forces, emigrants, clericals, the hidden representatives of the overthrown exploiter classes, nationalists, Zionists and renegades-communists.

The counterrevolution which had taken power hurried to organize the persecutions of communists and their supporters, recreated reactionary bourgeois parties, began to fabricate false accusations against communists, bring them to trial, compel them to commit suicide, and so on. Or else they simply did away with them, as it happened in Romania.

The fact that Erich Honecker, former prisoner of a fascist concentration camp, spent a night with his wife on a street bench after they were released because of a complete lack of any evidences, is an indelible disgrace for our leading "internationalists". You know there were our embassy and consulate near it. The "charity" of putting Honecker, a sick figure of the international communist movement, whose illness requires treatment in a specialized clinic, in a local Soviet field hospital, cannot but be a mockery.

After our example the counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia began to mock the dead. Mud was thrown not only at Klement Gottwald, but also at Yulius Fuchik, a hero of anti-fascist resistance, who was executed by the Hitlerites leaving us his last precept: "People, be vigilant!"

It is a good thing to recall how our former Soviet leadership, [illegible] cursed by the leaders of perestroika, saved G. Dimitrov, W. [illegible], D. Ibarruri and other figures of the fraternal communist parties. Doesn't all this suggest an idea of the direct complicity of the Gorbachev clique, together with the imperialists, in the organization of the counterrevolutionary events in the East European countries?

Doubly, the counterrevolutionary tendency in perestroika greatly aggravated the external political and strategic position of the USSR. The alliance of the states under the Warsaw Pact, the shield of socialism in Europe, has practically forfeited its class content and has been destroyed. The Council of Mutual Economic Assistance has virtually gone to pieces. The complete withdrawal of the Soviet troops from the East European countries has started under the conditions of actual strengthening of the American-NATO bloc.

It is not to be surprised that such development of events calls forth warm support from Bush, Kohl, Thatcher, Mitterand and other leaders of the capitalist world, without consulting whom Gorbachev and Shevardnadze are afraid of stirring a finger even in their own Soviet house.

Now our "best friends", under cover of the defence of human rights, try to get the USSR to discontinue international assistance to Cuba, Ethiopia and to the Palestinians. At the same time, the United States of America, which so cared for the "independence" of Lithuania and Estonia, brutally invaded Panama, brought reaction to power in Nicaragua and renders military assistance to the genocidal regime in Salvador, to the Unita bands in Angola, to the Afghan reactionaries and other similar "humanists".

I would like to remind that in the past in Europe they made many plans for the "Europeanization" of aggressive Germany. The latter tried more than once to Germanize Europe. The revival of powerful Germany in the centre of Europe now will lead to a sharp change of the political situation in the world. We know from history that united powerful Germany recognizes only satellites around it, but not the notorious "European house" apropos of which our propaganda lavishes so many illusions.

They say that at one time Stalin told beforehand that the factor of the durability of European peace was not eternal, but was limited to half a century. Has his foresight really come true?

I think that the increase of the instability of currency markets and diplomatic anarchy can only intensify the revanchist sentiments of the Germans and instigate them to create a "new order" in Europe by dint of power after the Hitlerite manner. What this would end in is well known to the European peoples including Germans themselves.

It seems that Bush and other friends of Gorbachev intended to mobilize Germany, morally support the weakened idea of pan-Germanism in it and equip it with powerful latest arms. Namely at a

time when the NATO is to be abolished since there is no need for it on the ruin of the Warsaw Pact, united Germany, under the leadership of the war industry complex of the USA, will assume the mission of the "Eastern steel barrier not only of anti-communist but also anti-Slav trend.... Thereby together with the dismantling of socialism and the Warsaw Pact political and ideological balance of forces will be turned in favour of the West. Therefore, I think that in Europe the reconsideration of the frontiers is predetermined. Such are the "successes" attained by the Right-opportunist group of Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze in the field of international policy.

Summarizing the review of the internal and external aspects of perestroika, we would like to mention that Lenin's foresight, emphasized by Stalin more than once, to the effect that with the advancement of the country to socialism class struggle may become sharp and take extremely dangerous forms for the working people, has come true. This conclusion which the "faithful Leninists", including Khrushchev and Suslov, refuted with particular frenzy, is now confirmed in full by the whole course of the events in the USSR and in the countries of socialist commonwealth.

All these processes could not but be reflected in the activities of our society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals", the consideration of which we shall now pass on.

II. The Basic Directions of the Activity of the "Unity"

When we analyse all the aspects of the work of the society, two contradictory sentiments arise.

First, an extremely large volume of the most various work has been done by our comrades in defending the ideals of socialism, in fighting against the falsifiers and slanderers of our history, and in researching the processes of the ideological and political life of the country.

It can be said that together with the "Unity" a whole trend of social movement has come into being, which is now recognized not only by our supporters, but also by the opponents from the camp of the "Popular Fronts", "Democratic Unions", "Memorials" and so on.

Secondly, I would like to emphasize that there is discontent about what has been done and what is being done, and dispirited feeling over the fact that we are always late in many problems. But the most important thing is that we have not succeeded in establishing a sufficient mass organization, although recent influx into our ranks is noticeably increasing.

At the Constituent Conference in May last year we agreed that the basic forms of our work would be research concerning the burning problems of the history and the present, their public discussions in the collectives, organization of lectures, meetings and demonstrations and speeches in mass media, appeal to the public and state

bodies with statements and requests, and participation in different campaigns (electoral, ecological, patriotic and others). All these forms have been applied in our work.

So many extracts from the letters of our comrades were published in *Pravda, Izvestia* and in other newspapers and magazines. Many of them were published in factory newspapers.

It seems to me that the scientific and practical conference at Moscow State University dedicated to the 110th birthday of J.V. Stalin was a success. Our young comrades Balakhwantsev, Kirsanov and Lapin took an active part in the organization of this conference. Vigorous activity was displayed by our comrades in the organization of rebuff to various kinds of falsification of history and abuse of socialism by the "yellow" press. In this connection I would like to mention the great work that is being done by the Orlov, Sverdlovsk, Rostov, Batumi, Feodosiya, Kiev and other committees of the "Unity". This work should be intensified, and our comrades must not lose heart because of the fact that it is extremely difficult to make their way to the press.

The weak aspect of our activity is inability to organize and conduct mass meetings and demonstrations. Only the Moscow committee has such experience, which deserves admiration and dissemination.

I would like to say a few words about our financial situation. It cannot be admitted as being satisfactory, although our all-union treasurer A.G. Soboleva exerts great efforts and staunchly guards the financial interests of the "Unity". She herself will make a brief report. I want to note that not all the committees pay in the stipulated share of the dues to our central treasury. Here I mean, before anything else, Togliatti, Moscow, Leningrad, Batumi and some other areas where there is a considerable number of organizations. Apparently we should adopt more boldly those measures which will pay themselves.

The situation in the country is rapidly changing. We should be able to keep pace with these changes. In this connection there arise the problems of mutual relations with the other mass organizations of the working people. In particular, in Moscow, Novgorod and other places joint work is going on with the United Front of the Working People. Unfortunately, here and there the United Front of the Working People evolves in the direction of anti-Stalin hysteria, unreserving struggle for power, intensification of pseudo-scientific scholasticism, and compromise in the principled problems with the cowardly part of the party organs and the Right-opportunist leadership of the CPSU.

Yarin, leader of the United Front of the Working People and people's deputy, became a member of the Presidential Council and declared in one of his interviews that the United Front of the Working People should be a member of the Independent Trade Unions.

Therefore, we must take into consideration which way it will develop if we cooperate with this organization. Here we should not lose our radical political status.

As is written down in Paragraph 5, Section 2 of our Rules, "The members of the society may take part in the international movement and in the work of other unofficial organizations, whose aims, slogans and practical activities do not run counter to the basic tasks of the "Unity". Only it is important to bear in mind whose interests a member of the society "Unity" will represent and defend in this: whether he will represent and advocate the interests of the "Unity" in the society in which he works, or, on the contrary, the interests of that society being in the "Unity". The first is desirable, and the second is, to my mind, inadmissible.

Recently there have been revealed many who wish either to subordinate the "Unity" to them, or spoil its work and split the activity of some committees. In particular, this concerns the Leningrad committee in which this role has been undertaken by G.I. Turetsky who shows particular interest in the lists, addresses and finances of our society and engages in the dissemination of extremely queer rumours. He is one of the most active members of the Leningrad United Front of the Working People.

I would like to say a few words about our entry into some kind of society. The "Unity" should not turn into an organization which is ideologically amorphous and politically compromising with the opportunists. Entering somewhere, all the more as a collective member, we will be bound our hands with somebody's decisions in ideological and political problems. What is more acceptable for us is an alliance, the working-out of common documents, and the organization of joint actions under the condition of complete independence for the "Unity".

Recently mass patriotic organizations, many of which are close to a socialist position, hold a large share. Their strength is in the mass character, of which we and the United Front of the Working People are so short. Under the conditions when the authority of the slogan "For a United Fatherland" is growing, I think that the influence of the patriots will increase further. Therefore, taking into consideration the principled unacceptability of the nationalist and anti-communist orientation of some of the leaders of these patriotic organizations, it is necessary to establish contact with the young people who have formed groups in these organizations, and organize joint actions against the common enemy: the restorationists of capitalism, separatists, Zionists and renegades. It should be emphasized that joint work with them requires great patience, self-control, calm and consistency.

In our work we should, jointly with the patriotic organizations, overcome sectarianism, isolationism, and learn how to distinguish the reactionary character of some of the leaders and sever them from

the masses of the young people in these organizations who follow [illegible] banners unconsciously.

I think that this extremely important work should be conducted persevering and thoughtfully not only in the RSFSR, but also in Ukraine, Byelorussia and other republics where there is an anti-patriotic tendency to throw the young people into the embrace of nationalism.

Our society is rich in intellectual potential and has not a few people who have large experience in political work among the masses, capable of leading the young people who are in confusion in tens of thousands of unofficial organizations and parties.

However, I repeat that we should not quit the principled position under any conditions. We are already recognized as a radical political organization based on the platform of fundamental Marxism-Leninism.

If the closest alliance of our comrades with the societies of socialist orientation such as the United Front of the Working People, "Stalin", the "Party of Workers-Marxists", as well as their participation in the work of these organizations are possible, such a form of joint work with the majority of patriotic organizations is premature for the time being.

Besides all this, the time has put a serious question to us about the ways of the subsequent development of the society "Unity" itself. In the final analysis, this is the question of the relation with the CPSU and with those processes which are now going there.

This also has something to do with the question of the multiparty system in the USSR which is becoming a reality. I would like to refer to these questions.

III. The All-Union Society "Unity" and the Crisis in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

The crisis of the Soviet society and that of the CPSU are mutually connected organically, mutually entangled and are mutually complementary.

In the period after Stalin the leading party gradually started to slip from the scientific-proletarian positions to petty-bourgeois, social-democratic, and Trotsky-Bukharin positions, tying critical knots in the society. Already in the 60s the resignation and elimination of party and Soviet cadres who were tempered in the struggle for socialism and in defeating fascism, by indiscriminately including them in the ranks of "Stalinists", led to the progress of the process of the bureaucratic, nationalist and social-democratic degeneration of the activists.

The Stalin leadership strictly fought against the internal danger of conceit and degeneration, foreseeing the practice of factionalism and the like. Subsequently, under the triumphal fanfare this struggle

began to cool down gradually, and then it completely ceased, thus allowing diseases to strike the party in the very heart.

As a result of the reforms of the 60s, in the economy there appeared chronic imbalance which gave full scope to the growth of spontaneous and stagnant phenomena. Hence constant underfulfilment of the Five-Year Plans, drop of the tempo of the development of production and of the growth of the welfare of the working people. The yearly reduction of prices ceased, and soon this was replaced by their rise. Moreover, the state policy became unable to retain the party and economic management apparatus within reasonable limits.

As a result, this apparatus began to swell and now it has expanded more than three times compared with the Stalin period. It had led to the alienation and estrangement of this apparatus from the people and this was reflected in the drop of the rate of labour productivity and in the lack of labour discipline, in the loss of moral stimulus and was expressed in mass stealing, plunder, the increase of irresponsibility, indiscipline and in other similar phenomena.

The "architects" of perestroika, having speculatively put the sign of equality between the Soviet state system and the bureaucratic apparatus, severed the state from the "deideologized" economy, and took out the socialist state system from the working-class status. The socialist state system is now incapable not only of managing the economy successfully, but also of providing the toiling people with the basic food products and the necessities.

At present the CPSU is objectively no union of like-minded people. Disagreement in all problems lacerates all its organs and structure. In the party all the petty-bourgeois groups and factions (Mensheviks, anarchists-syndicalists, nationalists-communists, Trotskyites) that have been rejected by history, have been resurrected and are active. Criticism and self-criticism have been substituted with boundless pluralism. The principle of democratic centralism is openly ignored, party discipline has been weakened and there is mass secession from the ranks of the CPSU. The Right-opportunist leadership has been severed from the rank and file of party members and from the Soviet people. In the CPSU there have appeared such members who consider it possible for them to engage in anti-socialist and anti-Soviet activity. Those who are of the same mind as Yu. Afanasiev, B. Yeltsin and the whole "Democratic Platform" have openly declared their refusal of Marxism-Leninism, but prefer to carry party cards, hoping to share in the party "legacy" (the treasury, immovables, presses and the like) before long.

The forfeit of the offensive communist position by the leadership of the country undermines the CPSU from within, leaves the working people defenceless before the restorationists of capitalism and impudent anti-Sovietists and throws some strata of them into the embrace of the anti-communists from the "People's Fronts" and

"Democratic Unions". There is conflict between the party leadership of perestroika and millions of the communists who have begun to understand that the Right-opportunist group of Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze fraudulently imposed a restorationist economic reform on the Soviet people, infringing upon the resolutions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU. Thus the party has found itself compromised before the people. The anti-communists seek to shift the responsibility for the crisis to the whole party, which is allegedly "lagging behind the tempo needed for perestroika", in other words, behind the speed of the restoration of capitalism.

At present there is the Soviet reproduction of the destructive aspects of the Chinese cultural revolution. In Tyumen, Volgograd and in a number of other cities there has been opened "fire on the headquarters"—on the regional and city party committees, the leaders of which have undertaken the perestroika of socialism into capitalism not too zealously. I consider that the problems of leadership over regional and city party organizations should be resolved by the communists at the conferences and plenums of party committees on the basis of an objective analysis and principled appraisal of the activity of their leaders. We should not be led by the crowd who have the mood of meeting-like glasnost. The restorationists have learned to lead the crowd away to the position of anti-communism under pseudo slogans. All this has become possible only under the direct and indirect support of the leaders-renegades from the highest echelons of power.

It should be born in mind that the post of the General Secretary was required to be reserved for President Gorbachev so that he, with the aid of social-democratic ram, could finally spoil socialism and reduce the CPSU to the status of a petty-bourgeois parliamentary party. Even though the Constituent Conference for the founding of the Russian Communist Party is convened, it is impossible to revive it free from degenerates, careerists, revisionists, opportunists and other worthless stuffs.

Let us recollect how the fruitless play started in the bureau of the Russian Federation. Moreover, this scanty sprout of the "self-sustenance" of Russia was limited by the fact that the bureau was led by the General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU. How, for instance, would the Latvian and Moldavian communists respond if Gorbachev was appointed to the post of the First Secretary of the CC of the communist party of their republic? And is the General Secretary, who is evidently not coping with his basic post of union-wide importance, in a position to take upon himself the responsible functions of the party leader of the RSFSR?

Social-democratism, which is now uniting essentially all the anti-Leninist ideological and political trends in the CPSU, was represented by two platforms: by the "Platform of the CC of the CPSU to the 28th Congress" and by the "Democratic Platform in the

CPSU". Here the former was hypocritically declared to be the alternative to the latter. In reality the differences between these two platforms are purely external, superficial and unessential. Both of them have the common positions of multi-structural, i.e., restorative economy, and equally set socialist society against socialist state and the economy against politics. In essence the differences between the two platforms are only in the degree of the disguise of desertion, capitulationism and apostasy from Marxism-Leninism.

The genuinely alternative platform for these both Menshevist platforms can be only Bolshevism as the scientific and proletarian ideological and political trend of the social and political thought and action which have endured the most rigid trials of the time. Should the 28th Party Congress bury the party and revolutionary Marxism in the Menshevist embrace, there objectively arises in the order of the day the problem of the need to revive in new conditions the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks-Leninists, which is called upon to smash Right opportunism, bring back the country from the quagmire of crisis, onto the path of genuinely socialist development.

The All-Union Society "Unity" can make a contribution to the Bolshevization of the CPSU and to drawing demarcation between Marxists-Leninists and social-democrats, Mensheviks and national-communists. We can and must promote the acceleration of freeing the consciousness of the working people from bourgeois and petty-bourgeois myths of market economy and non-class democracy, from the idealization of the bourgeois way of life that has been imposed by the restorationists and renegades. Thus we should expedite the ripening of the objective process of the dissatisfaction with Gorbachev-style perestroika.

As a matter of course, in order to stop counterrevolution, there will be needed large-scale theoretical and organizational work which, in my opinion, should proceed in the following directions:

—Return to renovated planned economy and strengthening of the socialist ownership of the implements and means of production;

—Distribution of wealth not according to capital or privileges, but according to the quality and quantity of the work each has done, while resolutely struggling against social injustice in socialist society;

—Strengthening of the leading role of the working class in overcoming the crisis and renovating socialism, and the establishment of genuinely democratic and humane forms of a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

—Correct combination of class and national interests as well as of the interests of all mankind.

—Strengthening of patriotic and international principles in the life of society and of its regions; reinforcement of the federation without weakening the foundation of the allied power;

—Establishment of Marxist-Leninist world outlook which is freed from revisionism and dogmatism and constantly developed and enriched on the basis of the experience of the international communist movement and socialist construction;

—Rallying, and unity of actions, of all the socialist and patriotic forces of the country;

At present the "Unity" is not on the level to cope with the enumerated tasks. In its activity it is now going through the "circle" period. In particular, this clannishness is expressed in that many people, instead of doing live work with people, concentrate on paper work and endlessly engage in copying materials which are then accumulated in private archives. Many of them are the collection of curiosities which do not answer the requirements of the present moment of the struggle for socialism, and others are framed, vying in using ringing phrases and sharp and even insulting terms which only alienate people from our society.

Some comrades, captured by purely historical problems, write volumes of hundreds of pages which cannot be published now and which, though they themselves are important, are not unfortunately urgent in the present situation. In a number of cases extremely great attention and strength is given to numerous trials, into which degenerates deliberately draw us by their insults, meaning, so to say, to "exhaust" us and divert us from our work.

Today the problem faces us in all its magnitude: in which direction should the society "Unity" develop in future? This problem is not extremely simple, and many people raise this question. Some people consider that we should remain an independent society, which should be registered soon. Others proceed from the view that the "Unity" should grow into a political party. There are several suggestions about how this party can be called. Either to call it the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks-Leninists, or the Party for the Revival of Bolshevism, or somehow in another way, something of the sort of Bolshevism, as an alternative to Menshevism in the CPSU.

We need to discuss all this. What is important is the essence which consists in that our party should have as its basic social base the working class and all those who stand on the position of this class and that its ideology should creatively develop Marxism-Leninism. It is a matter of course that the "Unity" is hardly able to successfully carry out the task of organizing such a party which will be a direct successor to the Bolshevik traditions of the CPSU. However, it seems to me that if we determine to do so, we can start this work.

Therefore, in the solution of the problem of the future of our All-Union Society "Unity", we can, in my opinion, discuss three ways:

First, the creation, after the 28th Congress of the CPSU, of a party into which can enter all those who part from the social-demo-

cratic, Menshevist Platform of the present CPSU, if such a platform will be adopted. We should have in mind that considerable difficulties are expected for us here. Outside of this party can remain those comrades who cannot leave the CPSU right away for some reasons and those who, as members of the party, have no right to be a member of another party at the same time.

Secondly, the "Unity" remains in the position of a politicized society, without pretending to the status of a party built on the principle of democratic centralism. Only in this case will it be hardly possible for us to get rid of clannishness, amorphousness and disorder which are now so characteristic of our amateur society.

Thirdly, it is possible to take a compromise version. To create a party of Leninist ("Comintern") type, into which will enter those comrades who are ready to submit to its Rules and Programme. Along with it, a politicized society can function with a corresponding name on a Bolshevik ideological and political base. It can play the role of the reserve of the party and can be useful for those whom the circumstances do not allow to leave the CPSU.

There may also be other versions here, all of which require serious discussion.

If we consider it possible to start the work of making preparations for the organization of the party, we should now elect the commissions for working out the Rules and Programme of this party, for the procedure of the formation of the primary party organizations and the leading organs, and for working out the standards of party documents.

It seems that we can expect success only if we, without being locked in our own shell, manage to establish business contacts with local party organizations, with Comrades Brovikov, Rafailova, Siverts, Chikin, Anafriyeva, members of the CC of the CPSU, and with the other participants of the February and March Plenary Meetings of the CC of the CPSU, with the wise and politically experienced communists, with the former party leaders and with the army political workers.

Here it is appropriate to emphasize that our society "Unity" does not long to take power. However, we will not follow opportunism which disguises its anti-popular policy with pseudo democratism and pseudo pluralism.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize that V.I. Lenin taught to find the main link in the chain of events and problems, which once grasped, makes it possible to pull out the whole chain, in other words, solve all the rest of the problems. I think that today such a link is the elimination of the Right-opportunist group from the leadership of the party and the country, without which it is impossible to find a way out of the crisis and consolidate all the sound forces of society on the platform of scientific socialism, Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism.

Irrespective of us, today more and more people come to such a conclusion, people for whom the slogan "Socialism or death!" has become most urgent.

Lithuanian International Movement, 1990
No. 4, pp. 1-4

---

[1] In the theses to the April Conference "On the Current Movement", it was noted as follows in particular:

On March 13, 1990, at the evening session of the Third Extraordinary Congress of the People's Deputies of the USSR, the post of the President was set up, and on the following day to this post was hastily elected M.S. Gorbachev, for whom only 59 per cent of the deputies voted at the elections. History will give its appraisal of this skillfully played performance. Today it is necessary for us to meditate on and appraise the new situation created in the country.

1. In spite of all the assertions of the restorationists and revisionists, the introduction of the presidential administration means actual undermining of the Soviet power.

2. The presidency is the political formation of the decisive stage of counterrevolution and of the capitalization of socialism....

3. The presidency has objectively confirmed the correctness of the foresight of V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin about the possibility of the intensification of class struggle at various stages of socialist construction....

4. The "supra-party president" is needed for ensuring non-socialist multi-party system, which is called upon to secure the transition to capitalism....

March 1990
Leningrad

* * *

SOCIALISM OR DEATH!

Question: *It is now evident that the government failed in its implementation of the economic reform programme it decided on some months ago. Do you think this government should resign? Who do you think should make up the government?*

Answer: Your estimation of the state of the government's programme for economic reform is certainly correct. But I think it represents nothing more than a partial, piecemeal and trifling phase reflecting a more full-scale, serious process in the country. The Five-Year Plan for Reform has completely failed. Instead of the "reinvigoration of socialism" and the "promotion of the development of the socialist economy", the country is faced with a catastrophe, and a serious crisis is cutting a wide swath through the economy and production, politics and culture, and morality and ideology.

In recent years thousands of the Soviet people have been killed, tens of thousands crippled and hundreds of thousands reduced to refugees in peacetime owing to the conflicts between nations. Taking advantage of the victory of the Rightist opportunists' group in the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the

restorationists of capitalism led the reforms along the road of anti-socialism, and this is the main cause of the crisis and the sorry poverty of the working people; this is my opinion.

The renegades in the leadership of the party and state realized that if they applied "shock treatment" by rashly raising prices their position would be jeopardized; so they started to seek a roundabout course from socialism to capitalism. I think that not only the Ryzhkov-Abalkin Government but also the whole Right opportunist group of Gorbachev, Yakovlev, Shevardnadze, Yeltsin and Medvezev should resign.

The new leadership to be elected should reject the transition to a market economy, deal a blow to the anti-socialist tendencies of the anti-socialist forces and put an end to the collapse of the multinational state and to the degeneration and disorder in the country.

This will be possible only when we free ourselves from our illusions about the "alternatives" proposed by the opportunists and revisionists now in the leadership. This illusion is propagated through the mass media under their guidance.

Some more about this matter—who should we choose, Gorbachev or Yeltsin. Such a "choice" is inconceivable. Both of them are in the same boat called opportunism. Gorbachev at the helm is requesting Yeltsin to row them to the shore of the capitalist paradise slowly so that the boat will not capsize. The quarrel between them is nothing but a family affair. Sooner or later Gorbachev will have to take the place of Yeltsin and the latter will be able initially to do what the "chief helmsman" cannot do. Being "antagonistic" to Mikhail Gorbachev, Yeltsin will win popularity among Gorbachev's opponents and philistines. Yeltsin possessed a party membership card before denying "being affiliated to the Communist Party", but the President emphasizes his "party spirit" by conducting fatherly criticism. Herein lies the deceitfulness that even the West has begun to recognize.

Question: *Do you think that Russia should gain the status of a state?*

Answer: The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic has not lost its status as a State, but its sovereignty is largely limited compared to the other republics in the Soviet Union. (It does not have its own Communist Party, Academy of Sciences and so on.) This is felt particularly in the following aspects. In the neighbouring republics nationalistic and divisive tendencies are developing and the centrifugal force is increasingly gaining the upper hand over the centripetal force in the multinational state; in some places they are trying to make a milch cow of the RSFSR on the one hand and, on the other, place it in the dock to charge it for all the negative aspects that occurred, and are still occurring, in our country.

The tendency to blame the RSFSR is particularly dangerous. We are now faced with an extremely vicious, new campaign that is aimed at provoking hatred of Russia and the Russian people.

Unlike in previous times this campaign is being conducted not only abroad but also inside the country.

The two currents of the nauseating and vicious campaign have merged and are causing ominous phenomena, and these phenomena may cause Russophobia. Voinovichs, Sinyavskys-Terets, Roi Medvedevs, Pompeyevs, Arros, Zolotutskys, Grossmans, Rybakovs, Epsteins and others who hate Russia and always attack it are casting slander, with venom in their hearts, that the Russian people are serfs and slaves who are primitive, indiscreet, cruel and fond of committing bloody atrocities. All these ideological heirs to Trotsky have vilified and are vilifying the people who, unlike the people "born with freedom" in the West, have never yielded to aggressors.

Unlike the people of other countries, the people of Russia did not kneel down to the marauding knights and Mamais, or to Sigismund and Karl the Great, or to Napoleon. They did not surrender to Hitler, either. Even under the dark rule of the Mongolian Tartars they not only preserved their culture, religion and distinctiveness but also restored their state structure. They did so at a time when the West was kneeling down in succession to every manner of conqueror.

Under the circumstances in which events which are clearly disadvantageous are taking place in international relations, a great fuss is now being made about the sovereignty of Russia. The Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR adopted a decision on its sovereignty. This is, of course, a good thing. Frankly speaking, however, I cannot conceive of the right of our republic to secession, the right to secede from the USSR. The principle of the priority of the Republic over the laws of the USSR and the right of the power organs of the Republic to approve or deny the Union law will not conform with the historical idea, the reunification mission, of "collectivism".

B. Yeltsin and his colleagues in the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR create confrontation with the "centre" everywhere possible and try to free themselves from its jurisdiction. But I do not believe that this will have any positive results.

This idea borrowed from the nationalists in the Baltic contradicts the historical role of Russia as the axis of a powerful USSR and as a link in the chain connecting fraternal republics. Objectively speaking, this idea inspired the secessionist trend in Ukraine and in other republics, aroused national egoism, and weakened the central government. To whose advantage is this?

Question: *We have heard a great deal from the representatives of "Unity" about the "guilt of the Jews" against the Russians, and*

against the people of the Soviet Union at large. Do you think this is right?

Answer: Whatever stain some representatives of a nation may have left, I am opposed to blaming the whole nation for it. Individuals should be called to account for their conduct. Otherwise there will be a "witch-hunt" inside the nation which would benefit the nationalists.

The misfortune for many Jews is that they have a morbid fear of the nationalism and chauvinism of other nations and are exceedingly loyal to their own nationalism, this is my view. In particular they are faithful to Zionism which tends to contain communities of Jewish nationalism. Needless to say, all Zionists are Jews, but not all the Jewish people are Zionists. Zionism is Jewish nationalism applied as a UN resolution notes, with racism.

Nationalism took the status of an international organization long ago and it is dangerous, for it is not confined to our territory, like the nationalism of Lithuania and Armenia and other places.

The danger of Zionism is growing because its representatives are infiltrating the private organizations characterized by anti-socialism and skilfully using our "yellow" mass media. We must not fall victim to anti-Semitism, which means a good gift to Zionists, and must remain on the alert to all the tendencies towards Zionism and deal a decisive blow at them. Many Zionist organizations like Irgun Tsioni are springing up, and many Zionist newspapers are being published. Socialist and patriotic forces should deal a counterblow to their activities.

Question: *What is your view on the events taking place in the Baltic republics and on their development?*

Answer: The Rithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic is proudly disobeying the resolutions of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of the People's Deputies of the USSR and Presidential decrees and has stepped up to the starting-point of the competition for the restoration of the bourgeois order before any other republics; mesmerized by promises from its "wealthy protectors", it is acting like a rash, frivolous woman who, while driving out the husband with whom she has been living for half a century, does not give up her hope of "squeezing" something more from him. But the "protectors", who admitted the frivolous woman into their house with enthusiasm, realize that breaking their relations with her relatives is not good for them. Therefore, all the illusions of the nationalists of Lithuania will become a daydream and the theoretical court proceedings will never end. B. Yeltsin, Sobchak, Salie and their clique are trying to benefit from it today, but to no avail.

Question: *It is now claimed that the Bolsheviks were extreme Right-wing social democrats in early 1917. Do you think that they should revert to that position again to "maintain order" in the country?*

Answer: Bolshevism reflected, before anything else, the position and interests of the workers and the poor and hired peasants, i.e. the broad low-level working people in urban and rural areas. So the Bolsheviks were extreme Leftists in the relations of the social democratic forces in Russia. Menshevism represented the interests of the urban petty-bourgeoisie, labour aristocrats and intellectuals, so it was the Right wing for social democrats.

Terrorism was not invented by the Bolsheviks. At the early stage of the revolution they released the enemies of the revolution whom they had caught red-handed, believing their promises. They paid dearly for this humanitarianism.

Red terrorism was introduced after an attempt was made to assassinate Lenin. It was a measure the proletarian state was compelled to take in order to cope with the enemy's atrocities.

The revolution must be safeguarded or else, it will have no value. In a state where the hostile class exists, the state power always assumes the form of the dictatorship of the ruling class. This dictatorship is merely the class-oriented content of the politics of the state; it is never the ways and means of governance. The ways and means of governance can be humanitarian and democratic when no one threatens the power of the ruling class, economically in particular. If such a threat appears, it will assume a cruel and forceful character.

What should be stressed is that Gorbachev needed the authority of a President when the reform's tendency to return to the past faced opposition and came to a standstill. The initiators of the presidency are none other than those who are trying to restore capitalism. They called capitalism "socialism with humane aspects", but the nasty faces of the Mafia entrepreneurs who invented thousands of ways of plundering the Soviet people have already appeared under that socialism.

Question: *Are you critical of the progress of the democratization of the country? If so, why?*

Answer: I support and welcome wholeheartedly socialist democratization, but I am critical of the progress of the unsocialist democratization.

As is known, violence and cruel conduct are linked in the world with "freedom", "equality", "democracy", "humanitarianism" and other values common to humanity. All that which is immoral is justified and disguised as ennobling and sacred. For instance, when the

new rich and other swindlers of the cooperatives and the newly emergent entrepreneurs are on the one side and the conscious industrial workers and kolkhozniks are on the other, will they accept these values in the same way? Obviously, the two sides attach totally different significance to the concepts of "democracy", "glasnost" and "humanitarianism". The newly-emerging bourgeoisie, and their such ideological assistants as publicists, economists and lawyers try to apply other criteria of a social definition, criteria different from those of the 43 million Soviet people who are living under the poverty line. It is therefore not only premature but also dangerous to throw the concept of socialist democracy away in the refuse-bin of history.

As for socialist democratization, I think that democracy for the sake of democracy is the straight road to anarchy, chaos, and demonic government which is mob power, resulting in the deterioration of society and the state. Democracy is, first of all, the ways and means of solving social, economic, scientific and ideological problems, political tools; democracy itself is not its purpose. It is the general and class essence of democracy. Democracy is necessary for achieving success in finding a solution to the problems arising in social development. How satisfactory the solution is depends on the form and means of the democracy.

If, for example, the Leningrad Soviet discusses for months the issue of assisting agriculture in the province, the discussion will be futile when the weeds outgrow the vegetables, making them wither away. For whom is such "democracy" needed? It is not by chance that V.I. Lenin used the simple question, "Whom does it benefit?" as a yardstick for distinguishing democracy from psudo democracy, that is to say, whether it is beneficial to socialism or to capitalism. We should ask this question frequently.

Question: *Recently more and more young people have been turning to the embrace of religion, seeking spiritual satisfaction in solitude. What do you think is the way out for them?*

Answer: The young people are the future of a country. From this point, a great effort is being made to disrupt the younger generation. They are becoming degenerate because of pornography, prostitution, the ambition to make money, and cruelty. All these are causing an increase in the number of youth crimes. For the young people new "heroes of our times"— "the masters of life" and supermen who preach the principles that "All is permissible" and "Money does not smell"—are emerging in our country. So the young people are seeking them and the latter is "hunting" the former.

Among the "hunters" churches occupy a significant position. The intensification of the people's feeling of social isolation and their uncertainty about the future serves as a hotbed for developing

the mystery which creates religion. Confidence in one's strength is replaced gradually by an anticipation and empty dream that a miracle might be wrought; it is a spiritual narcotic. But illusions calm the people only for a while; the spiritual stability provided is broken sooner or later by the contradictions of the real world.

The propaganda of scientific atheism conducted by the mass media has stopped and, instead, religious views are propagated.

Komsomol Pravda and other newspapers are adorned with photographs of marriages at churches and religious functions. I respect the right to religious belief, the right of everyone to preach any religion or propagate atheistic views, but it is irresponsible for the state to push the people to dark beliefs in medieval ideologies and draw their interest away from the questions of the times, the danger of the collapse of their motherland.

Certainly, there is a way out of this. It is to ensure that young people take an active part in the solution of the problem of whether to return to the past of capitalism or to march along the road of the October Revolution, a matter decisive of the destiny of humanity.

The latter road has never been simple or smooth. It is beset with danger today, because it means fighting those disguised as "democrats" who are attempting to transform socialism into capitalism. Some of them are not even trying to conceal their ambitions. For this means exposing the Right capitulationist leadership of the CPSU. Without the cooperation of this leadership, the capitalist restorationists are not able to gain any victory over socialism. Moreover, they are openly vilifying the Rightist leadership of the CPSU. (The editor may underline this sentence, but in this case I can only hope that socialist pluralism will prevail.)

Question: *How do you and your comrades in "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" appraise the 28th Congress of the CPSU? Do you have any intention to leave the party?*

Answer: The party congress did not rescue the complicated situation prevailing within the party and the country; on the contrary, it further aggravated the situation. The contradictions between the socialist and anti-socialist forces were not eliminated; they became disguised, protracted and further concealed.

With the transition to the market economy, the privatization of the tools and means of production, an unsocialist multiparty system, an anti-communist campaign and anti-Leninist hysteria as a background, terms "socialism", "socialist option" and "communist prospect" contained in the report to the congress and in the documents adopted at the congress are hiding the real alignment of forces. Although many delegates were severely critical in their debates, the congress did not deal a counterblow to Right opportunism, social-democracy, Menshevism and national communism.

Apparently some people are fond of the compromising and unprincipled stand.

What I think is particularly dangerous is that the leading roles of the Politburo and Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CPSU have been radically reduced, and this can be proved by the fact that the leading renegades are concentrated in these bodies as well as in the Presidential Council. Apparently the General Secretary has a political committee, a consultative body, which offers no forceful resistance to the transformation of socialism into capitalism, just like the Presidential Council.

Besides this, the 28th Congress of the CPSU, in the wake of the Inaugural Congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR, levelled a principled criticism at the leaders of Right opportunism. To our regret, this brave criticism was not consummated in an organizational fashion. But the renegades conducted a campaign to brainwash such delegates and vilify the "conservatives" through a repeated show of hands on the same issue, something unprecedented in the history of the congresses of the CPSU. The pressure from outside by "democrats" and other schemes by "parliament" was applied to the Congress.

The General Secretary showed that he is a master of hypocrisy and unprincipled compromise. All the efforts made by the restorationists and revisionists notwithstanding, one-third of the delegates to the congress clearly realized that the market economy is the road to capitalism and a bourgeois way of life, and actually opposed it. Another third or more, particularly delegates from distant places, did not understand the propaganda of the "prime movers", and they heeded the leaders of the reform, as is their habit.

We can see from this that the efforts are being intensified to "brainwash" all the citizens in the spirit of changing socialism for capitalism.

I think that the 28th Congress of the CPSU dealt a heavy blow to the international working-class movement and the international communist movement which are now undergoing a serious crisis. As many distinguished revolutionaries and communists from other countries are saying openly now, the blow does not fall short of betrayal. In places where a direct struggle against imperialism and neo-capitalism is being fought, there are not many who preach that capitalism and socialism are similar, that imperialist plunderers can be turned into socialists, and that the interests of humanity, the bourgeois interests, are superior to the class interests of the exploited and oppressed people. Only Bush, Thatcher and their like extoll the reformist leaders of our country and the "success" of their policies.

In my view, it is a gross miscalculation for the imperialists and the capitalist restorationists in the country to think that they have won. It is a Pyrrhic victory having no strong social basis and based on demagogue and deception of the masses. No matter how carefully fraud may be conducted, it cannot survive long; the reality lays it

bare. Doubtless, the working people, the main force of production in society, will come to realize what the road to the capitalist market will mean to them. They will not come under the yoke of the exploiters in and outside the country again now that socialist relations, though not so developed, have reigned for 70 years. We must fully understand the capitalist order of production, politics and social development. The generation who had a "good knowledge" of capitalism have disappeared, and activists are tempting the present generation with honeyed words.

The promotion of the market economy and privatization will inevitably cause the resistance of the working people to be intensified; they will realize sooner or later what awaits them. A sharpening of the class struggle in the urban and rural areas is awaiting us. In this situation the anti-Soviet elements and anti-communists will direct the justifiable complaints of the working people against the party, which is directed by the Right opportunists who have driven the country into chaos. In this way they will entomb socialism along with the party and break the superpower into divided dukedoms. To our regret, the 28th Congress did not turn the events in the direction of resurrecting and consolidating socialism.

Today Yeltsin, Sobchak, Popov, Tikhonov and others who have hidden their true nature as anti-communists for a long time, are members of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Who will help the party overcome Right opportunism in its leadership? Who will defeat the anti-communism that is entrenched in the Soviets with the help of the renegades? This is not an empty question. In autumn "Unity" will convocate a conference, which will be a conference for reconstructing the party of Bolsheviks and Leninists.

It is too early to speak about it today. Events are taking place at a rapid speed. The contradictions are becoming sharper by the hour, not by the day, and the national conflicts are growing aggravated.

Anger is rising among the people. The cry of the restorationists and renegades for "civil peace" clearly shows that the country is approaching a civil war. The only guarantee for preventing it is to reject the transformation of socialism into capitalism along all lines, but the Right opportunist leadership is not yet ready for this. The working class and its Leninist party, army, naval forces, and young people rose up in the struggle in every corner, the struggle between Bolshevism and Menshevism, between internationalism and nationalism, between patriotism and cosmopolitanism and between Leninism and Trotskyism.

Socialism or death!

Komsomolets, Chelyabinsk
August 17, 1990, pp. 6-7, 10

* * *

HISTORICAL CAPRICES*[1]

On entering Memel (Klaipeda) City which had undergone many historical trials, the Soviet army discovered that there were only a few citizens there. The citizens there who became the citizens of the "thousand-year-long Reichstag", had been taken to Germany for the continuation of the failed "total war." The Soviet garrison headquarters discovered that there remained only a few families and orphans, who claimed to be German even though they had Lithuanian names. After the war they could go to West Germany and most of them made use of the opportunity. This is clear evidence of the implementation of the "complete programme" to make Lithuania German. The programme to make Lithuania German was first proposed by knights in the 15th century and was brought to completion with the Hitler cliques' occupation of Klaipeda on March 22, 1939. The Hitler clique imposed such a fate on all the people of the Baltic area. This cruel programme was formulated by Alfred Rosenberg, an ideologue of the German Reich, according to which the peoples of the Baltic republics were assimilated to Germany racially and those who opposed this were evacuated. Inspired by the first victory, the Fuhrer, in July 1941, energetically declared to his assistants in his "wolves' den" that the whole Baltic area should be incorporated into Germany. In connection with the "undesirable elements", the Jews, Gypsies, Slavs, communists, anti-fascists, all "intellectuals" and so on were "expelled" to the insatiable furnaces in Oswiecim and Midanek. Who could foretell then when this "migration" of the so-called "non-Aryan" people would come to an end?

With the passage of time, the generation who had saved humanity from the brown pest, reversing events with their unrivalled bravery and devoted labour, became old and passed away. Without the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition no one could conceive of a political system, sovereignty, human rights, national culture, official language, perestroika and so on. Alex de John, a professor at Tuson University and the author of the book *Stalin* which was published not long ago in the United States concluded that "If Hitler had beaten the USSR, there would now be no Russians, nor would there be French, English or Americans."*[2] If we enlarge on this conclusion, there would be no Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Lithuanians, Estonians or other peoples. Such is the significance of our victory in the Great Patriotic War which some of the people are now intending to reexamine.

Such a reexamination is difficult and they are making desperate efforts to discover roundabout routes. One of them is to recognize the illegality of the Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact concluded on August 23, 1939, which furnishes some of our "comrades" a pretext for declaring the Soviet Union an accomplice in illegal deal

with the Nazism, for recognizing the aggression by Germany in our country not as a crime and for declaring the righteous war of the Russian people as a fight between competitors in international plunder. Even the weekly *Argument and Fact* in its new year appeal to readers concentrated on the decision of the Second Congress of the People's Deputies which denounced the "aggressive policy" of Stalin's leadership. How many pieces of paper were wasted in spreading this absurd nonsense! The First Congress of the People's Deputies organized a committee to evaluate the pact and they elected as chairman A.N. Yakovlev, a member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CC of the CPSU.

I want to express my opinion of the result of this committee's work. I am going to speak not only on behalf of myself but also on behalf of my father, brothers and sisters and the friendly people who fell in the battle to defend our socialist fatherland.

The German Reichstag's fire caused by the Hitler clique clearly showed to the whole world the aggressive nature of fascism and the inevitability of the future war as early as 1933. The inevitability of the war necessitated the accelerating of the whole country's preparations to protect it from the aggression, the postponement of the attack as much as possible, the finding of allies in the never-friendly world and the holding of diplomatic negotiations for the creation of an anti-Hitler coalition. All these tasks were difficult for the country which had begun to build socialism on a full scale in the situation of a hostile capitalist encirclement.

One of the speeches at the 17th Congress of the ABCP quoted a passage from *Mein Kampf*, in which Hitler wrote: "We are completing the endless march of Germany to the south and west of Europe and are changing its direction to the east. We have completed our colonial trade policy and are going over to the policy of finding new lands. When we speak today about the new lands in Europe we can think only about Russia and its dependencies. It seems as if fate itself is indicating this road. Handing over Russia to the Bolshevik power, that fate deprived the Russian people of the intelligentsia who created and guaranteed their national wealth up to now."*[3] What an outspoken class definition of the aspiration to dominate the world! Are they still lamenting, together with A.N. Yakovlev, over the fact that the world ideal of justice and humanism did not become social, or in particular national consciousness? Talk as much as you like about the "profound element of the total democratic attitude to the world" or about the "ethical and moral conviction of the public!" What mark did the reality of the hostile contradiction of the society leave on the "ideal", "attitude to the world" and "conviction" in the '30s? I think there is only one answer—it left nothing.

The USSR Congress of People's Deputies recognized that the Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact concluded on August 23, 1939 did not violate national law or international norms. But its negative

results were emphasized. Every contract, including this pact, consists of a compromise. In this case it was the compromise between the aggressor and its future victim. The articles of the contract were seriously analysed in our academic world.

The secret protocol of the contract which was deliberately not mentioned to us is another problem. But nobody hid the content of the matter raised. The Soviet government did not actually make secret the agreements concluded with Germany. All the maps and boundaries which surprised the Congress of People's Deputies were made known to the world a month after the conclusion of the agreement. On September 23, 1939, *Pravda* wrote; "The demarcation line between the German and Soviet armies which the governments of Germany and the Soviet Union concluded was along the River Tissa to the River Narev, along the River Narev to the River Visla, along the River Visla to the River San and to the reservoir on the River San."*[4] The contract held back the Hitler divisions, but when Poland was defeated they rushed to our border.

I think the planned discussions at the congress which discussed whether there was or was not a secret agreement diverted the attention of the deputies and society from the more urgent problems which were not simply of historical significance. In my opinion, People's Deputy A.N. Yakovlev went astray, alleging that the talks with Berlin 1939 could have been confined to the pact and that all the closed part, hidden part, so to speak, of the pact presented a "conspiracy" and "imperialist ambition". If we consider the pact as such, won't it make the nonaggression pact an empty piece of paper gained in exchange for our extensive economic, political and ideological concessions?

In the secret protocol were indicated the formation of the Soviet-German front in the Second World War and the winning of time before the aggression towards the Soviet Union. I think it would have been self-destructive to await with folded arms the Hitler clique's aggression towards Narva, Pskov, Minsk, Kiev, Nikolaev or Beloostrov, a suburb of Leningrad, which was situated near Smolny where the German tanks could arrive in less than an hour. The Hitler clique created continuous hindrance to the realization of the pact. A fresh concession from us was necessary, and this was the German-Soviet pact on friendship and the frontier concluded between the USSR and Germany on September 28, 1939. If we follow a French king's saying that "Paris is worth holding a High Mass", we can point out that we needed some kind of pact or secret contract and its protocol for Russia, socialism and the existence of humanity itself. And history cannot be made "politics overturned to the past." If so, we shall have to rewrite history all the time.

In the end the aggressors' terrible strike was received by us on June 22, 1941, in the western area 250-350 km away from the former frontier and there the Red Army had its first battle, which ended

in defeat. No matter what we think of that battle, in the course of it the Germans used up the first two weeks of the six to eight weeks allotted for its "lightning war", according to the "Barbarossa" plan. Those two weeks enabled us to concentrate our forces and to prepare for the battle around Luga, Smolensk, Kiev, Odessa and Murumansk so as to take up another 4 or 5 weeks which were precious summer time for the aggressors who were obliged to extend their supply route and to undergo people's guerrilla warfare in their rear just before the decisive battles for Moscow and Leningrad.

If we had not gained this time, we could neither have crushed the blitzkrieg nor forced winter warfare on the Hitler clique. If we had not gained this time, Alexander Yakovlev, the platoon leader of the seamen division, would have had to lead his men in the final attack somewhere around the Ural Mountains instead of the Pogostie area around the River Volkhov which might have had serious consequences for himself and his country.

When we talk about the "Ribbentrop-Molotov pact" another important part is usually missing. In the end the pact enabled us to gain future colleagues in the anti-Hitler coalition, many of whom had endeavoured to direct the aggression of Germany to the east until the year 1939. Thanks to the pact world imperialism could not form a unified anti-Soviet coalition, even though Hitler's attack on the USSR was backed by the armies of Romania, Italy, Hungary, Finland and Spain. Due to the conclusion of the pact militarist Japan could not make up her mind to start a war which gave us the possibility to evade war on two fronts, something which would have meant a mortal war for our country. Wasn't this a brilliant diplomatic victory that made a great contribution to victory over fascism? Can the "new political thought" which is extolled as world moral principles ignore this? Can that "thought", which is mentioned in the "brilliant paper" of Deputy Yakovlev, replace the class moral of the defenders of the first worker-peasant state in the world with the notorious "Stalinism"?

Addressing the mass meeting held in Boston in December 1941, Davis, the former US ambassador to Moscow, spoke highly of the Soviet leadership and its foresight in "liquidating the treachery in the country and producing thousands of tanks and planes" when the democratic forces were feeling at ease in a false sense of security*[5]. His appeal for help to the Soviet Union in its righteous struggle was reported in many newspapers in the United States and Great Britain.

The exaggeration of the personalities and activities of Stalin and his supporters is the most general topic. Books, poems, scientific monograph, political essays, drama, films, etc. were produced about it. I think that the time will come when we analyse and appreciate without prejudice the results of the anti-Stalin campaign, since it is more mortal than the distortion of all cults and worships for the international working-class and communist movement and the world

socialist countries. Anti-Stalinism now appears as camouflage for anti-communism and anti-Soviet activities*6.

In his speech to the participants in the funeral of the international fighters who had fallen in Africa, Fidel Castro said that our state (USSR) "rendered such a contribution to humanity that annihilated fascism and dynamically accelerated the liberation movement in colonial countries, that we wanted to forget it today, and that the fact that many people even in the Soviet Union itself began to refuse and defame historical feats and distinguished exploits of their heroic people gave rise to hatred."

The first Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba emphasized that it was beyond imagination that the first socialist country had charged its leaders with irresponsibility, that it had argued that the revolution, the annihilation of Nazism and social progress had gone wrong.

To whom is the reexamination of the political estimation of the Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact favourable? Is it necessary to discover the truth? It is doubtful because the prerequisite in view of the conditions is too strong. In addition, the truth has never been and will never be defined by voices which support that truth even though they are the voices of the respected people's deputies of the Soviet Union. I think the heinous nationalists in the Baltic republics who are making desperate efforts to restore capitalism and separate their republics from the Soviet Union make the most of the results of the reappraisal of such a history. Here I think that the ladies and gentlemen are making too much haste, forgetting that the final voice is that of the people, the true defenders of the historical and moral traditions of a powerful state. In connection with this I am going to quote a poem by my favourite poet Felics Chuev, who is very much disliked by our home-bred anti-communists, restorationists, nationalists and all their present ideological maids.

If anyone succeed to pass of
The lies as truth with honeyed words
The state officers' corps will
Say their formidable words
... ...
I will accept the future with my heart
Without ruining the past
Even today our own army
Is our hope[*7]

In my opinion the deputies who approved the decision of the congress concerning the Soviet-German pact concluded in 1939 objectively, either consciously or unconsciously irrespective of their intention, helped those who want to belittle the immortal exploits performed in our victory in 1945, to reduce the greatness of this victory in the consciousness of the people and to describe it as insignificant, accidental and of minor importance, and those who intend to cross out the significance of this victory for the destiny of the world and to eliminate our victory from the minds of humanity. So the first step is being taken to alter the history of the Second World War and the Great Patriotic War according to the prescription of Western historical science. The negative effect of such a decision will soon be revealed.

War-Historical Journal, No. 6,
1990, pp. 10-16

---

*1. On April 15, 1990, N.A. Andreyeva met in Moscow the Major-General V. I. Filatov, and handed him the manuscript of the article "Historical Caprices with the New Thought". The editorial board slightly shortened her manuscript and carried it under the title of *Historical Caprices* in the column of "viewpoint, judgement and opinion".

*2. *Our Contemporary*, 1987, No. 5, p. 157.

*3. The 17th Congress of the CPSU, January 26-February 10, 1934: Shorthand Records, Moscow, Political Books Publishing House, 1934, pp. 127-128.

*4. *Pravda*, September 23, 1939

*5. *Pravda*, December 19, 1941

*6. N.A. Andreyeva made a report on May 2, 1992 at the international press-centre in Brussels which was entitled "Anti-Stalinism Is the Trojan Horse in the Communist Movement in the Second Half of the 20th Century". She said as follows:

Summarizing the mentioned abvove, I point out that the economic preconditions of anti-Stalinism in the Soviet Union were above all the inability of the leadership of Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Gorbachev to cope with the objective difficulties in the growth of socialist production and introduction of capitalist elements in socialist economy, which made it expendable and ineffective. In social sphere the roots of anti-Stalinism lie in the emergence of the "shady" neo-bourgeoisie, its gradual growth, emergence of the strata among the working people of town and country who lived off their labour, expansion of bureaucratic apparatus of management, alienation of elite intellectuals from the masses of people. In the political sphere the foundation of anti-Stalinism is rooted in the working-class being driven out of the leadership over the country, in weakening the worker-peasant state power, in the opportunist degeneration of party leadership. In the sphere of international policy it is the underestimate of the class substance of peaceful coexistence of different socio-economic systems. In the sphere of ideology the precondition of anti-Stalinism is the inability of the CPSU to develop Marxism-Leninism in the new historical conditions.

The experience of three or four decades of the Soviet history clearly shows that the main enemy of Stalin's leadership—opportunism—inevitably and naturally degenerates into open restoration of capitalism. Anti-Stalin hysteria played the role of screen for stepping up anti-Lenin and anti-communist campaign as a whole and then was employed by counterrevolution to destroy socialism and the powerful united Soviet power. Anti-Stalinism is a Trojan Horse in the international communist movement, which led to the ruin and degeneration of the parties of the former community of socialist countries which blindly copied the line of the CPSU.

More and more Soviet people begin to understand this, read Stalin's works, create societies named after him and publish newspaper *For Motherland, for Stalin*.

*7. *Moscow*, 1989, No. 11, p. 19.

* * *

From October 27 to 28, 1990 the Third All-Union Conference of the Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" was held in Leningrad. 276 delegates and 92 invited guests, who represented all the union republics and autonomous republics and 36 outlying districts and regions of the country, took part in the work of the conference.

The conference heard and discussed the report of N.A. Andreyeva "Let Us Prevent Catastrophe! Let Us Bring Those Attempting to Liquidate and Bury Our Socialist Motherland to Justice!"

The conference approved the Rules of the society and elected the political executive committee of the "Unity" in place of the coordination council. N.A. Andreyeva was elected the chairwoman of the political executive committee.

The adopted resolution "On the political distrust of M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU" expressed the demand to convene the 29th Extraordinary Congress of the CPSU and discuss the following problems as its agenda:

1. On dismissing M. Gorbachev and his most fervent associates who have given full scope to bourgeois counterrevolution in the Soviet Union, from all the elective party posts and expelling them from the ranks of the CPSU.
2. On recalling Gorbachev and his minions from the deputy corps to which they belonged only because they were party functionaries.
3. On immediately leading the USSR out of the national crisis so that it can advance along the road of not restoration of capitalism, but of comprehensive socialist cleaning and renovating.
4. On examining the real causes and political mechanisms that created a critical situation for the Soviet State in the years from 1985 to 1990, which is unprecedented in its acuteness and danger and on making those who are guilty bear party and other responsibilities.

The conference adopted the following appeals of the "Unity": "Appeal to the working class, kolkhoz peasantry and all the working people of the Soviet Union", "Appeal to the Soviet people, communists and soldiers" and "Appeal to the students".

The conference was held at the assembly hall of the Leningrad Higher Submarine Navigation Naval College named after Lenin Komsomol. Vice-Admiral Ye. A. Tomko, president of this college, a famous Soviet submariner and Hero of the Soviet Union, was attacked by "democrat" mayor Sobchak for having permitted to hold the conference on the campus and in the end, was made to resign the army.

LET US PREVENT CATASTROPHE! TO CALL LIQUIDATORS AND BURIERS OF SOCIALIST MOTHERLAND TO ACCOUNT!

Dear Comrades,

During the five months since the Second All-Union Conference of "Unity" held in Moscow, the crisis has gone from bad to worse in all aspects of state, social and party activities. The decision by the recent Plenary Meeting of the CC of the CPSU points out:

"A chain reaction is taking place in the break-down of economic ties, and the volumes of output and national income are decreasing. Deficits prevail, speculation is rampant, and prices are rising. The sources of dispute and conflict among nations have not been eliminated, and the number of crimes is increasing. Cultural destruction is

more and more widespread, and the anti-Soviet and nationalist demonstrations have resulted in the destruction of bronze statues of Lenin and blasphemy committed against the graves of fallen soldiers of the Soviet army. Communists are being humiliated and persecuted.

There is no end to such disgraceful "results" since the meeting of the CC of the CPSU. Today, however, these are no more important than an analysis and exposition of the basic bearing of counterrevolutionary developments in the country, than the discussion of the tasks of the all-union organization of "Unity" for the promotion of Leninist, communist ideals at the present stage of capitalism's revival in the Soviet Union. This is a possible way out of the crisis.

1. The Strategy of Socialism's Grave Diggers and Their Driving Force

Historical comparison shows that there is a similarity between the situation prevailing in our country now and that in the summer and autumn of 1942 when the Hitlerite gangsters were advancing on Leningrad and Stalingrad, having occupied Ukraine and Byelorussia, and were advancing towards the mountainous regions of the Caucasus and Baku, when Japanese militarists were attacking in the Far East, and our Western allies, losing confidence in Russia's power of resistance, were thinking of their own interests. In that year of tragic ordeal, we maintained a united front in the struggle against our class and national enemies, a front connecting the combat positions, partisans' dugouts, workshops at factories, fields at Kolkhozy, design shops and scientific research institutes. We were armed with Soviet patriotism, political and moral unity and the friendship of the people. The international working-class and communist movements, the anti-fascist resistance in each of the occupied countries of Europe, and the peoples and armies of our allies stood in the same ranks with us. The Bolshevik party, which was united rock-solid under the leadership of the authoritative J.V. Stalin, organized an all-people struggle. The armed forces that had matured in the course of the war were guided by the advanced military science and socio-political theory of Marxism-Leninism. Outstanding Stalinist military commanders led the army to victory.

Now things are different. Society has been divided, the united front of the struggle against those who are trying to revive capitalism has been undermined, the party leadership has been disrupted by the defeatists and lost its prestige among the masses, the wealth which had been accumulated through the people's labour has been squandered and misappropriated, the unified powerful state has been dissolved into hostile dukedoms, the CPSU has lost the unity of its ranks, the state has become non-ideological, former economic power has been lost, and the army's reputation has been damaged. The

camp of the socialist allies which are loyal to Gorbachev has crumbled, the world communist movement is in crisis, young people were violent and the inhabitants are indignant. In this situation resistance to those attempting to eliminate socialism is spontaneous and scattered, due to the lack of leadership.

Hence, our cardinal task is that of forming a united front in the struggle against those who are trying to bury socialism and to abandon it and of rallying the socialist and patriotic forces to Bolshevik positions.

The Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union and the RSFSR and other republics are widely discussing the programme for a transition to a market economy. Various programmes of this kind have been proposed, and the President's programme has been adopted. All these programmes, however, are in essence identical. There are programmes for a return to monopoly capitalism through the market, mass poverty, unemployment, transaction centres and exploitation. Gorbachev continues to assert that this is a new path and that there is no other alternative for our country. Its inventors are not Shatalins, Vuniches, Petrakovs, Abalkins or Yavlinskies. What they presented to the Supreme Soviet for deliberation is the well-known "stabilization programme" drafted by the International Monetary Fund for lesser nations as early as the 1970s. The programme envisages a sharp rise in retail prices, a wage freeze, the devaluation of the currency, economic decentralization, a reduction in investment in the social and cultural sectors, and the provision of optimum conditions for the activities of domestic and foreign capital. All this leads us to the conclusion that Gorbachev's perestroika will not only bring about the revival of the historically outmoded form of capitalism, but also degrade and break up the country, the world's second superpower until only recently, by means of political and social civil war, and will reduce it to a raw materials supply base for the United States, Japan and the NATO imperialist powers.

A multinational financial oligarchy is thus making "geographical space" for neo-colonialism in the 21st century. This is aimed at making the socialist and developing countries black slaves of debt and turning them into sources of cheap labour, into a storehouse for their strategic resources, into a rubbish dump for the distribution of industries that destroy the ecological environment and for the disposal of harmful waste matter, and into a market for the sale of their secondary surplus commodities and for the realization of services. "Aid" for perestroika will save the West from its economic crisis.

As you know, this summer the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR enacted the law of the sovereignty of the republic, declaring the preference for its laws over the union laws, and fanned renewed nationalism in Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia and other republics. These republics soon surpassed the Russian Federation in their separatist tendencies. According to our Latvian comrades, Yeltsin's visit

to the Baltic countries in his new role was accompanied by repeated hunting trips and parties and contributed to adding fuel to the flames of nationalism and animosity against the "occupiers". Characteristic of the visit was the fact that the "clumsy comic actor" and "political impostor", as he is called by Gus Hall, met only the local nationalists and anti-Soviet elements for discussions. This "democrat" flatly refused to meet the leadership of the international front, of the people's organizations that use the Russian language, veterans, meritorious people and local party bodies. He gladly discussed with Landsbergis, Ryuitel, Gorbunov and the like about the formation of a "united front" against the "centre". Here the "centre" meant the Soviet Union, the strong unified socialist state, not Gorbachev who was still respected by the Baltic chauvinists. The crumbling of this country since the introduction of markets is the second greatest danger facing the country.

Today, the disintegration of the Russian Federation is progressing more rapidly than ever before.

After Yeltsin's visits to the Volga zone, Siberia and the Far East, the tendency to separate from the centre grew in Tatar, Bashkir, Buryat and Yakut and other areas which proclaimed themselves republics. Worse still, Yeltsin, this "advocate of popularity", the once party-card carrier, who is ignorant of who supports him and ignorant of his course of action, who sold out the Kuril Islands and the social interests of the Russian working people, said in a speech at the Ural University of Technology, "After a national referendum in the Russian Federation seven Russian republics, Central Russia, North Russia, South Russia, the Volga zone, Ural, Siberia and the Far East, will emerge." To these should be added the "free enterprise zones", the modern settlements of neocolonialism, to be established by the Supreme Soviet and local Soviets. All this is becoming a reality before any national referendum is conducted. The tendency to break from the centre and act in a decentralized manner is based on economic reasoning, namely, they assert that they will switch over to a market economy, they will make investment on their own, they will make themselves self-sufficient, and they will be fully self-financing republics. Who can't see the difference between the concept of self-financing by a production unit and that by a large-scale national zone and by an administrative area? One is the path of progress, the other is the path of seclusion, of selfishness and of destroying the common interests. In the condition of an economic crisis, it is a variant of the slogan, "Live your own way." The logic of the process of such development shows that it does not stop within the bounds of a republic, but spreads through the rural Soviets and urban districts.

A few words about the "union of independent states" proposed tenaciously by Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Primakov and their supporters. The treaty among the union republics now in preparation is designed

to divide the Soviet Union into separate states. Under the present circumstances in which nationalism, chauvinism, general instability and decline hold sway, the attempt to speed up the signing of the treaty is a deliberate act of destroying our multinational country, because it does not even plan a nominal union but an economic alliance of state organizations, such as the Comecon. This alliance is designed for members to join at any time or withdraw if anything goes wrong. It is like a capitalist market where one seeks only profitable partners.

If the "free market" pushes us into the world imperialist system as a raw materials supply base, the "treaty of independent states" will inevitably undermine the national and political independence of the Soviet Union in its present condition. This is being calculated by the anti-communist and anti-Soviet elements at home and abroad. What is obvious is that our country lacks its own experts who are capable of destroying socialism and the multinational state or else they are not fully trustworthy. For this reason, Yeltsin staffed a quarter of the members of his economic coordination council with foreigners. Well, has Yeltsin any guarantee or assurance that the "Varangians" whom he has invited to become involved in state administration and the treasury of the Supreme Soviet are not paid by the CIA or the Israeli Masada or other similar organizations? Surprising is this inrush of foreign "experts", entrepreneurs, experts on the Soviet Union, culture propagators, economists and others who come to supporting Gorbachev-Yeltsin reforms. And yet our mass media say that they are acting "selflessly".

Another thing: last summer Gorbachev and our financial experts held a consultation with Grispan, the director of the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States. After the consultation, dollars were exchanged at Soviet banks at a rate ten times higher than the official rate. I believe that this not only benefited the United States directly, but also made American capital the unseen "manager" of the current financial transactions in our country. These things infuriated even our former compatriots in exile. One of them wrote, "Clinging to the heels of a bloodsucker is the act of a political fool or of a deliberate pro-American idiot who does not value the existence of his country as a politically independent unit."

Now it is clear to everyone that perestroika was prepared a long time ago by anti-communist elements of all descriptions who were blessed and supported by their guardians abroad. This fact is now being reported not only by the radio but also by the "leaders of the reformists" themselves through our "yellow" and "yellowing" publications in the name of non-socialist democracy and glasnost in publishing. Now, they do not hide the fact that the process of capitalism's comeback was agreed beforehand and that they had to "repress" their joy at the initial stage in order not to fall victim to their own "boldness". They fooled the party and the people by slyly

hiding their aim of achieving a revival of capitalism. Only now have people come to see what a terrible provocation took them hostage. To our regret, this realization came too late. One reason for this lateness is that counterrevolutionary forces have seized the mass media, the most powerful of modern instruments, and the restorationists have made them a means of false reporting and deception for the inhabitants, the young people in particular.

What is required of us now in the prevailing situation is to discard the concept of perestroika which many of us have acquired recently and which has been reflected in "Unity" documents. Now it has become clear that no competition has existed between the socialist line of perestroika and the non-socialist line of perestroika. Nobody has tried to "revive socialism" or "promote its socio-economic development". There has been only a hypocritical socialist covering the revival of capitalism in our country, a revival that assumed that character of treachery to the state at the time, according to the Constitution and other laws which were effective in the mid-1980s.

As for the "socialist choice", "communist perspective" and "strong centre", let us not be charmed by them. Let those party officials who are afraid of being dismissed from their posts take advantage of the false advertisements such as "policies", "programmes" and "decisions" that are much vaunted by M.S. Gorbachev. It is not by chance that the General Secretary has said recently that his perestroika was a "great" merit! For his meritorious service he was awarded the Nobel Prize by the West.

It would be preferable to hear what was said by those who are working confidently and secretly for the revival while speaking endless empty words on the rostrums of party congresses, conferences and plenary meetings of the Central Committee. Shatalin said, "The introduction of a market means transition to the capitalist economy." For this purpose, this Academician is struggling to meet undisclosed socio-political requirements. Abalkin, Aganjbyan, Petrakov, Bunich and other members of Gorbachev's "headquarters" are helping him, and their leader is playing with "humanist, democratic socialism".... It must be remembered that in such a political situation the masses often demand their resignation.

As you know, the victory of the capitalist revival is impossible without a counterrevolution, and all the objective and subjective symptoms as defined by V.I. Lenin are ripening in our country.

First, a situation is being created in which the lower stratum "does not wish to live in the old fashion" as they put it, namely, under socialism. In order to prove this, the restorationists had to push the country into the abyss of a market economy, private ownership and total collapse. For this purpose, the "architects" and "superintendents" of perestroika plunged tens of millions of people into poverty, uncertainty about the future and a state of general discon-

tent, and attributed these to socialism and the revolution, to the 70 years of the CPSU and to Soviet power. To this end, indifference concerning the social system, the attitude of not caring at all so long as one can eat one's fill "by any means", is being infused into the Soviet people. Isn't it for this reason that the anti-communists, along with the opportunists, have worked to destroy socialism and damage its reputation over the past 30 years?

Secondly, a situation in which the "upper stratum cannot live" has been created. An attempt to smooth over the "political crisis" by increasing the presidential authority has failed. The President and the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union and the republics have proclaimed successive decrees and laws, but no one implements them. The excuse has been made that there are no apparatuses capable of ensuring the implementation of the laws and decrees. So, did they exist in the past? There were fewer than now. Laws and decrees contain the will of the ruling class. To translate this will into reality is the most important of state functions.

For many years the restorationists and opportunists have been destroying the socialist state, pulling down its economic foundations, have weakened it and made it economically powerless, and have rendered it impossible to protect the working people from the fraudulent plunderers, selfish cooperative organizations, organized crime and armed gangsters and bloody acts by the bourgeois nationalists, and to prevent anarchy, bureaucracy, irregularities and corruption. It is not surprising that such a state is forsaken by the people, has lost their support and assistance, and is unable to ensure the observance of the law and to control the political and criminal situations.

A short time ago, at the Presidium of the Cabinet of the Soviet Union, N.I. Ryjkov and the members of his Cabinet characterized the crisis in the upper stratum as the "paralysis of political power", as the "destruction of the system of state operation." During the past year and a half there have been 1.5 million unsolved criminal cases (out of a total of 3.7 million cases), and yet 20 per cent of the examining judges are reinvestigating what they call "cases of persecution in Stalin's time". No explanation of this is needed.

Thirdly, according to V.I. Lenin, the essential symptom of a counterrevolutionary situation finds expression in "unusually acute poverty and misery". I don't think that this requires particular explanation, either. The shops are empty, prices are soaring, and 50 million people are now living below the poverty level. A "cigarette revolt" and a "bread revolt" have broken out, and 600,000 people have lost their homes and so joined the ranks of refugees in peace time.

Fourthly, there is the symptom of crisis such as a "very high degree of mass activity". The strengthening of the social foothold and the driving force of the counterrevolutionary process must be

identified. Formerly, black-market dealers, speculators and their allies, the corrupt aristocrats, posed a problem, but nowadays the officials of economic bodies, Soviet and party organs who "barter power for money" belong to this category. Factory managers who belong to the leadership of the cooperatives at factories, the presidents of universities who make a fortune by means of their science of black-market dealings, the leaders of local Soviet who from selfish motives organize the "best favours" for predatory cooperatives and selfish enterprises, Komsomol leaders who benefit from corrupting young people in video show rooms, and party officials who open businesses with collected membership dues are the reserves of the newly emerging Soviet bourgeoisie.

Minister Bakatin said, "Corruption and degeneration have spread to all fields of state management." One third of the roubles in circulation is channelled into black-market dealing, and one quarter of those who have misappropriated the people's wealth in the country belong to the leadership at factories and workshops. Profiteering and commercialism are sweeping the country. Lobbyists from domestic business confidently attack state organs, the media and the congresses of the Supreme Soviet and of local Soviets.

The infantry in the counterrevolutionary coup is also working briskly. Its ranks are being reinforced with more and more idlers, hooligans, alcoholics, drug addicts, prostitutes, smugglers, armed service shirkers, small-time swindlers, robbers, and other degenerate elements. Under the guidance of an organizer, they come out in the streets and squares for many mass meetings, gatherings, demonstrations and "civil disobedience" campaigns. Their anti-communist, nationalistic and anti-army slogans are seen everywhere. The activities of these elements who are "outside" as ordinary working life are obviously being encouraged by somebody. For instance, Sasha Bogranov, although permitted to leave for Israel, unexpectedly refused his exit visa and became the publisher-cum-editor of *Anti-Soviet Pravda* which is circulating widely from Nevsky Street.

Such a situation is being supplemented today by the subjective factor of counterrevolution. This factor means "the capacity of the existing force to organize mass actions" and the full preparation of the political parties with the ability to arouse the masses to a coup d'etat. Recently in the country 11 thousand organizations and groups appeared, of which 20 political parties declared their existence. Of them, more than 90 per cent have nationalistic, anti-socialist and anti-communist characteristics, ranging from social democrats and anarchists to Zionists and monarchists. The political centre of the current counterrevolution is also formed by the Supreme Soviets of the RSFSR, the Baltic republics, Moldavia, Georgia and Armenia, and the Soviets of Moscow and Leningrad as well as the power organs of some cities and regions. In the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union the role is being played by the "inter-regional organi-

zation" made up of "democratic" deputies. As far as I am concerned, acts of provocative, political robbery by former investigators Ivanov, Gdlyan and General Kalugin of the State Security Commission are shown, and are thought to have been offered secret acquittal by Gorbachev and Yakovlev.

The counterrevolution is accelerating the work of formulating political ideas with which to rally all the socialist forces under its banner. Such an idea is the "Action Programme–90" which created a stir two months ago, a political plan aimed at a spurious Left, counterrevolutionary coup d'etat. According to those who drew up the programme the Soviets of their comrades-in-arms, too, have reached the end of their time and cannot guarantee socio-economic benefits for the comprador bourgeoisie of the Soviets and the foreign investors at the present time. This has resulted in the drawing up of such slogans as "Abolish the Soviets!" and "Transfer all power to the Constituent Congress!" To this end, a variety of actions beyond the constitutional rules such as a general political strike, civil disobedience campaigns, the seizing of the buildings of the CPSU, the nationalization of property belonging to trade unions and the suspension of army mobilization have been initiated.

The role of the shock brigade in the coup d'etat is to be entrusted to students and middle-school pupils, young nationalists and the members of the juvenile action unit, other youth collectives and strata who are supposed to "open fire at the staff office", as prescribed by Trotsky.

The major stumbling block for the rebels are the army and judiciary institutes against which nowadays the most violent attack is being launched. Soldiers on regular duty are hostile to their officers, the commanding officers to political officers, the officers to the generals, and the people to the army, and rumours of all hues are circulating.

It is intended to organize within the not too distant future a professional army with a view to disbanding the ranks of officers, an army in which mercenary soldiers will be offered "better treatment than the US army." The campaign against the army has the support of youth publications such as *Komsomol Pravda*, in which the pacifist scum is most active. Irresponsible budget reduction has brought about the crumbling of military industry, a guarantee for safeguarding the security of the country. In 1991 the budget reserved for the army was reduced by 20 per cent. A few days ago the Minister of Defence said that if such a state of affairs continued "We would soon have no army."

The army itself, which saved the country several times and which still remains as a bulwark of socialism as yet unaffected by the destruction by restorationists, is asking for protection. As was the case with the counterrevolution in the past, the attack on the socialist system was accompanied by an attack on "the people in

arms." Today the work of protecting the army has become a task for all of us. Our All-Union organization can do a great deal to strengthen the cohesion between the army and the people.

Such are the main characteristics, conditions, indications, state of affairs and facts of the situation in the counterrevolution, the threat to the power and integral systems, the honour and independence of the country.

In winding up my views on this matter, what I want to emphasize is that the general and most essential review of the restoration leads to the conclusion that it marks the death of our motherland. Our motherland is being guided towards the death which was sought by international imperialism during the Second World War but which was checked then by the farsighted policy of the party and the state and by the heroism displayed by the Soviet people in socialist construction and the war against Hitler. An analysis of the state of affairs shows that everything taking place in our country is not national but international in essence and has taken an international form of a struggle between allied imperialism and socialism. In other words perestroika in our country is characteristic of anti-socialism worldwide. As Bush said, "Perestroika in the Soviet Union took place not in a vacant space but was linked with the growth in strength of the US."

Until the mid-'80s the main means of struggle of the imperialists against the Soviet Union were the "cold war" and nuclear blackmail. But now they rely as their major weapon for destroying the socialist system on the internal anti-Soviet forces. What has made this possible was the "new political idea" of our leadership for perestroika. After the meeting between Bush and Gorbachev in Malta the rapid collapse of the socialist community, the Warsaw Pact and Comecon took place while, following their meeting in Finland recently, the "two super powers" made a great fuss about "a new international order" which was immediately embodied in the joint actions of the Soviet Union and the US to defend the interests of Western imperialism and Israel in the Near East.

All this was bound to affect the CPSU, with the result that the party began to enter the second stage of crisis and degeneration.

2. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Restorationist Perestroika

As everyone knows, the perestroika of the party did not start overnight, and therefore the "contractors" of perestroika had to make long preparations for the conservative tendency of the CPSU. At first, excellently elaborated and organized ideological preparations, anti-socialist in content and anti-Stalinist in form, were made and soon effected in the whole state. At the second stage the "perestroika" of state structures and the capitalist privatization of the

private ownership is impossible. Now in the Soviet Union the parties and organizations which aim at "further stirring up social disagreement" have been suspended. What sort of disagreement is this? Does it indicate a disagreement between the exploiter and the exploited or the oppressor and the oppressed, or employed labour and capital or the speculators and the working people? Because of the amendment to the constitution the working people of the Soviet Union a long time ago lost even "the presents" given them by the capitalist world and our General Secretary stood in the same ranks as leaders such as Pinochet.

At the 28th Party Congress some party activists, including E.K. Ligachev, who expressed different opinions and stood from those of the capitulationist-restorationists, were removed from the top leadership of the party. The mistakes committed by these political activists were that they were about to confront the renegades systematically "at the highest level" and did not appeal to the masses of the party membership in order to preserve the non-existing "unity of the party." Their political opponents launched a campaign of the most heinous slander against them, trying to incriminate them in the failure for which the General Secretary was entirely responsible, in disregard of elementary decorum. These party members, who are honest subjectively, confirmed by their political defeat the true value of a sense of party principles, audacity, uncompromising sense, reliance on the masses of party membership and not trusting individually "the leader" when his political stand is fundamentally altered. This failure has also confirmed the harm done by the neutrality and connivance of anti-Stalin hysteria which normally develops into rabid anti-communism and anti-Leninist campaign.

What is particularly important today is to find a political lesson in I.K. Polozkov, the First Secretary of the CC of the RSFSR, and his comrades. The flag of Bolshevism tossed away by the renegades and capitulationists must be held up by strong hands. Should tradesmen and businessmen emerge victorious, we will all be hated and humiliated by the working people of several generations to come and the revolutionaries of the world.

The Gorbachev-led collective of the leadership body of the CPSU devotedly "met" the social demands of the enemies of the October Revolution and Bolshevism, and might now disappear peacefully in the mire of history. But the Gorbachev-led collective still does not seem to be disappearing. As many people use, the many accounts of the secret bank vault may be open.

I do not think it is sufficient to judge the main activists of the Gorbachev-led collective as mere Right opportunists or revisionists who are ignorant of the results of what they have done. What many people have concluded is that the crimes committed by the Gorbachev-led collective are found in the serious crises produced in all fields of the activities of social life in the Soviet Union, in the

destruction of the foundations and superstructure of socialism, in the collapse of a multinational country and the world system of socialism, in the crisis of both the international working-class and communist movement, and in the degeneration of the CPSU into a parliamentary party, a social democratic party, a Menshevik party embodying the ideolo-political orientation of Trotsky and Bukharin. This crime is great, and cannot be denied or pardoned. This shows that "the architects" of perestroika took the road of betrayal.

For all this, I think that the current conference of the All-Union Society "Unity" should adopt a resolution requiring the CC of the CPSU to call M.S. Gorbachev to account as regards the party, expel him from the party and end his authority as a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the CPSU. This matter should, I hold, be considered at an open conference of the All-Union, in which all communist party members may speak. Our duty is to attend to the work of organizing the members and non-members of the communist party through such a party conference and other meetings, mass rallies, demonstrations and the mass media. The slogan to be held high at the fore is "Let's punish the abolitionists of the Leninist party and the destroyers of the socialist motherland!" Now is the time when the deceptive theory on perestroika of "no alternative" put forward by the Gorbachev and Yeltsin clique should be disclosed. The way out of the crisis for the CPSU is to maintain the sense of genuine collectivity in party leadership. If this principle is violated the people concerned must be called strictly to account before the party.

The skilful politician, if there be such a person, will be able to ensure that the political forces keep pace with each other in the parliament. But, it will be extremely difficult to achieve a political balance if the switch to capitalism is to be effected within two months. Unlike the Supreme Soviet or a conference of the CPSU, parliament embodies different relations between political forces. For there are not only immediate profits but also the longterm relations of the interests of the working people, and the relations of their genuine class interests will also be active. This will have to be realized not in the words of deputies or representatives but in the practical class struggle based on inviolable laws, which has been buried hastily by the anti-communists at home and abroad. But in fact, although they are preaching about "citizens' peace" and "social harmony", afraid of a class upheaval, they will always increase the anxiety of the people.

We must be prepared politically and ideologically as well as organizationally for the approaching social struggle. Determination and an uncompromising sense should be the same as those of the legendary grandparents of Budenny who dealt a scathing blow at the Golitsin-Obolensky clique who were defending their, figuratively speaking, "cradle of aristocrats" and the parasitic way of life, a rich

life furnished by the sweat and blood of the people.

Cowardly intelligentsia! Do not think that we wish "the stirring of social contradictions" and bloodshed. We most resolutely and thoroughly oppose the aggravation of socio-political confrontation. But, we do not intend to hand over to anyone the achievements of the October Revolution. We will accept all forms of struggle forced upon us by the counterrevolution. Herein lies the meaning of the slogans "Socialism or death!" and "The motherland or death!" As there was no land for the fighters at the Stalingrad Front in 1942 to retreat to across the River Volga, today we have "nowhere to go" "on the hill of capitalism" to which the restorationists are pushing us.

Today an important task for the party and Marxist-Leninists is to introduce Bolshevism in all the fields of party activities to which we should attach scientific, class and proletarian characters and revive genuine Leninism which was weakened by the revisionists. It is a mistake to think that today the CPSU is composed of minority renegades, opportunists, privileged bureaucrats and corrupt elements, revisionists and opportunists. The CPSU is made up today of primarily people working in underground pits, those working at open furnaces and rolling machines and those gathering crops labouriously, those carrying out duties before the control panels of strategic rockets and in submarines and fighter-bombers and those treating patients and training children. Their viewpoint of the past and the present may be different, but their relations of interest are the same.

3. The Work of "Unity" and the Tasks Facing Us at the Present Time

We can say that our circumstances are changing and our concern for the socio-political movement is increasing across the country. In the past month I received over 1,000 letters in which most of the writers requested that they should be accepted as members of "Unity". Some are sending me letters in the name of large collectives of comrades. And some of them are now joining us in our work. During the preparation of the conference more than 100 programmes and plans were proposed as regards the way out of the crises in the economy, politics and history. They are all different in their content but similar in their aspiration to understand and rectify the present situation.

Another indication of the growing prestige of "Unity" is the presentation of many of our comrades in the mass media such as publications. During the second conference there were only a few names of people who had contributed to the editorials and talks, articles and publications, but now they are several hundreds. They are presented in the notes of newspapers and magazines sent to me. "Unity" is publishing 4 newspapers in the areas of Moscow, Orel, Ashkhabad, Dnepropetrovsk. This is nothing but a first step, and

though our publications are not yet complete, the genuine feelings and aspirations of the publishers and editors to fill the news vaccum caused by the fake pluralistic publications offset the shortcomings of our first step. I would like to refer to the standard of the newspaper *Unity* which is using all genres.

Our concern for the political movement has increased outside the country, too. This concern is also enhanced among the fraternal communist parties with which we have relations of practical comradeship. Primarily I can mention the Communist Party of Japan which sends us on a regular basis the newspaper *Akahata* which carries documents from our organization. Its initiators were the leading officials of the department of international affairs of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan and Kagawa Giro. We cooperated with our Italian comrades initially through the newspaper *New Unita* which carried a lot of materials from our organization, including the rules and regulations of "Unity". In August Domeniko Sabio, the chief of the famous weekly *L'Uguaglianza Economica e Sociale* (Economic and Social Equality) proposed "the establishment of international cooperative relations." This weekly is run by the Marxist-Leninists of Italy who are struggling to refound the Italian Communist Party after the Italian Communist Party broke up and became a social democratic party opposed to Marxism-Leninism due to the manoeuvrings of the opportunists. A few days ago we had a meeting with the hardcore elements of the Belgian Labour Party, one of the political parties of the Belgic Marxists-Leninists. The delegates of this party visited the Soviet Union and Leningrad as members of a trade union tourist group. During 6 hours of talks we reached an agreement to exchange magazines and other information materials of which one of the delegates was working as an editor. We reached the same opinion concerning the situation in the Soviet Union and international communist movement. Thus the prestige of perestroika was damaged. Through their letters and appeals our comrades in Japan, Italy and Belgium expressed their feelings of internationalist, proletarian solidarity with our organization "Unity" and wished us success in our struggle for Marxism-Leninism and socialism.

Now the relations between the Western countries and us have expanded in scale, to the extent that there is a failure to deal with many problems promptly. The problems do not lie only in the translation, such as from Japanese. I think it is time for us to involve competent translators in our work so as to develop in a purposeful and intentional manner the international relations of the organization "Unity". We can no longer work on a narrow scale.

The necessity to strengthen the political and moral authority of the organization "Unity" is explained by the change in the character of the letters sent to me from abroad. Except for the letters of those people whose spirits are close to ours the others were in the past

concerned with religion. Now they are different and what is more interesting is that some renegades who left our country have been sending me letters. I would like to quote two of them.

Nonna Osipova, who defected to America and who said that she had done a great deal to accelerate perestroika in Moscow wrote the following in her letter: "I am indignant now that Yeltsin has made public the transfer of all Russian dwellings to private ownership. You may know something of the advantages of life in the USSR but you may not know 90 per cent of what I have experienced in this country in which money decides everything." She went on to say that her pension was 475 dollars (this amount is more than the salary of our President in the new currency rate of rouble) with which "I cannot pay my rent." Her rent is 300 dollars. But her landlord is going to raise the rent by 30 per cent, to enforce which he is even ready to employ thugs. This former exile writes that if she is invited to visit the Soviet Union she will inform the Soviet people of the danger facing them through the mass media.

Not long ago Boris Bernstein, in a letter sent from Israel, said that he agreed with "Unity" on all issues, except only for a different point of view on the European problem. He sent his letter to the country where his father had advanced as far as Berlin together with other Soviet people fighting fascism under the slogan "For the motherland!", "For Stalin!" He wrote that Jews "remain as human beings who will no longer bring disaster only when Zionism loses its teeth." According to him, he had been deceived by the Zionists and was awakened to this truth "after he had become the slave of rich people who are fattening themselves on drinking, gluttony and prostitution, believing in the god of wealth. Israel is a gang of 'talented', 'resourceful', 'knowledgeable' and 'modernized' gangsters. All Jews are the incarnation of vicious hearts, thugs with stone hearts devoid of emotion, love and conscience. Their wisdom was born to harm other people." The exile wound up his letter with the following remarks: "Russians are an example to all the people of this earth in their patience, privation and suffering. May God help Russians, much-suffering, kind-hearted and naive." The writer of the letter does not wish anything and he refuses to seek ease in Christianity or to fight.

It is not because I sympathize with these miserable exiles that I introduce these letters, but because I want to show how strange, sudden changes are occurring in the consciousness of these people and how they are acquiring a new outlook on the value of the reality. Our activities are bound to have an effect. The reason I think lies in the validity, progressive sense and sense of principle of our stand that is arousing the sympathy of more and more people. We must know the way in which we can express certainly, seriously and persuasively our stand without using such insulting expressions as we see in our leaflets and statements.

Here I must talk about the necessity of maintaining the unity and integrity of our political movement. What makes me do so is that a newspaper published in Moscow carried news of the division of "Unity". Now is the time of obscurity and conflict in the environment. Changes are taking place in political and social structures and organizations, and fronts and parties engrossed in petty-bourgeois spontaneity are being dispersed. It became the tactics of the struggle for many people to create division in hostile camps. New political organizations are also appearing quickly.

A short time ago the television broadcast a party "conference" of "conservative democrats." What is surprising is that, though this collective has put forward ideas that are diametrically opposed to Stalinism, they wear the portrait of Stalin on their breasts. Coming into existence are also monarchic political parties composed of pseudo-democrats and pseudo patriots belonging to a part of "Pamyatsi", but they are antipathetic to one another. The two poles are joined. Their common ideological base is anti-communism and their social base is the union of surviving Cossacks, bourgeois liberals, aristocrats and churches, which is contrary to the union of the working class and kolkhoz peasants.

Beaten by the vitriolic criticism and concentrated attack, and as the political circumstances change, the Left opportunist leadership seems to be trying to achieve a wider "consensus." On the right of this association will stand the anti-communists who are in the same ranks as the extreme nationalists of member republics and on its left will be some of the patriotic and socialist forces together with OFT and "initiators" of which the leadership will be made up of many lecturer-socialists who will be hooked by the bait of compromise and by the bait of appropriate "posts" left by the leadership. They have already surrendered to the Gorbachev-style estimate of collectivization and our history of socialism and are steeped in anti-Stalinism.

"Unity" cannot be judged to be free from division. We are still young in our involvement in politics and we still lack much. I do not think there are people who want division inside our organization. If there are such people, they might be somewhere else. As far as I am concerned, our difficulty arises from, above all, a shortsighted viewpoint, immaturity, a lack of self-control, and an unnecessary number of doubts.

We frequently forget that a slight disagreement should not result in division. What is to be considered is that in argument the comparison of the grounds of logic does not automatically lead to a correct conclusion. The last stage of verifying the truth is the practice and work, the basis of truth. Providing that we proceed from the interests of our work, truth will always side with us and division and confusion will cease to exist.

The second conference of "Unity" put forward the matter of the

various possible forms of making this organization Bolshevik including its transformation into a party of Bolshevik-Leninists. Through a verbal and written questions among the members of "Unity" we realized that this problem was more serious than we had thought. In particular, 15 per cent of the people who answered the question consider that the founding of a Bolshevik party should be proclaimed without delay. Most of them are non-members of the former CPSU, or defectors from the party at different periods including the recent time, or communists in the Baltics. The major ground for the argument of these comrades is that many Marxist-Leninists are defecting from the CPSU, whom the party we are about to found should accept so as to uphold the banner of Bolshevism. This is an important aspect of the ground to which attention is to be paid.

Another group of those who expressed their opinion on the questions raised supports the contention that primarily "Unity" should be made Bolshevik and then it should be proclaimed a party. On what ground do these comrades base themselves?

Firstly, though dispersed and wavering, the CPSU was a large mass organization of the working people and will be so in the future, too. Therefore, inside the CPSU Bolshevism should be introduced and a struggle should be launched to remove the social democrats and neo-Mensheviks, the proponents of democratic programme and the degenerate elements ensconced casually seeking the property of the CPSU and the involvement in the distribution now at hand. It is serious that these elements can easily leave the party ranks. The proponents of this ground are based on Lenin's idea that the Bolsheviks should work where the popular masses are present and hold that the most active and authoritative officials are still inside the CPSU.

Secondly, the party members to be admitted to the Bolshevik party must leave the CPSU which is in its most serious difficulties. One veteran soldier wrote to me, "How will the people, either alive or dead, feel who vouched for me and admitted me to the party at the front after the crossing of the River Dnieper?" I can understand his feelings.

Thirdly, by defection from the party, we will seem to be opposed to the millions of devoted communists who have been struggling to defend socialism and against the restorationists and capitulators. The comrades think it will be good for us to put out a struggle programme to make the CPSU win over to its side regional and branch organizations and through them admit to the party our supporters and begin to affect party institutes with Bolshevism. This is an interesting opinion!

Fourthly, the comrades say that we should ensure that Bolshevism pervades "Unity" before calling it a Bolshevik party.

A transformation to a genuine Bolshevik movement cannot be achieved merely by words or slogans. Only when every effort is

made to create a Bolshevist party of the CPSU and it is proclaimed can the working people follow it. In other words, it should be bound by its historic responsibility as the defender of the heir to Bolshevik, Leninist traditions. We are not Christian democrats and we know what we must defend and inherit. According to many people, for us to proclaim our party a Bolshevik party immediately is merely to change its title.

Lastly, some comrades point out that we have made a mistake in the composition of the delegates to the current conference. In fact, we elected delegates only in two or three cities and as for the others, we invited them. At the last conference we elected a programme and rules committee and a committee for preparing the inaugural conference (procedures for preparation, the rate of choice of the delegates, documents about the delegates, etc.). The drafts of the programme and rules are ready at hand. But as for guides, we urged the people concerned on two occasions to prepare them, but with no result as yet.

What I want to emphasize besides this is that this matter must be resolved by this conference, not by coordinating committees or committees or by certain people. I acknowledged that it was necessary only to inform our comrades of the state of the preparations of this matter. I will have to follow the decision of the conference. In principle we have a consensus of opinion as far as the matter of making our movement Bolshevik and of Bolshevik-Leninists founding the party is concerned. The only difference in our opinion is about the duration, condition, and method. Democratic centralism will be conducive to ensuring that the conference adopts proper decisions.

Last Saturday was held a joint conference of "democratic Russia" at the "Russia" cinema in Moscow. The restorationists are joining their ranks on the basis of the common ground of anti-communism. Now comes the time for all the people of the anti-market economic, socialist and patriotic stand to maintain the integrity of their motherland, defend the legal rights of the Soviet people and pool their efforts to consolidate the socialist state. Today it is not important whether this unity is called either an "alliance" or a "front" or "association." What is important is that each organization belonging to it will be able to double its strength through mutual aid and joint action on the major front of the struggle against the anti-communist attack without losing its character, and its sense of independence. In such an integral whole it will be possible to achieve an exchange of information and materials, the joint formulation of theoretical problems and political documents, and mutual aid and mutual support in press activities and joint action. In consideration of the fact that many leaders of the organizations and fronts of the republics will attend the conference of the organization called "Unity" it will be good for the current conference to provide the basis of the integral whole.

Thus, it should be viewed that the immediate, major orientation

of the activities of our movement is to effect Bolshevism in the organization and achieve unity with socialist, internationalist and patriotic organizations. Proceeding from this underlying strategic orientation of the activities we should, based on new rules and a new programme, discuss and formulate tactical methods in the matters of intensifying organizational work by relying on the principles of democratic centralism, of stepping up the struggle against anti-communism, revisionism and restorationistic, and opportunistic manoeuvrings, or improving the coordinating committee, of organizing an institute for work among the masses of people inside the committee and of developing relations between the socialist and patriotic organizations and foreign communist parties. The times are complex, the work is unfamiliar, there is not enough time for a general discussion, and our enemy is cunning and will not "fall down" on its own unless it is "crushed" by the people.

In a few days the whole of mankind will celebrate the 73th anniversary of the founding of our Soviet state.

Comrades, congratulations on the coming holiday! The banner of the Great October Socialist Revolution shall open up the road for our struggle.

Although it is dark in our hearts today the laws of history side with socialism. Just is our cause! Unsuccessful shall be the restoration of capitalism! Our common Soviet family shall remain a socialist state!

Let the souls of the people who defended and built our socialist family not be abused!

Victory awaits us!

The Lithuanian International Movement
1990, No. 4, pp. 1-4

* * *

ANTI-COMMUNISM IS THE ROAD TO REACTION AND FASCISM

Today we are witnessing the extreme aggravation of the class and national conflicts in our society. Every year more than 40,000 men in the Soviet Union are falling victims to political, economic and nationalist banditry, hundreds of thousands of people are being wounded, crippled and losing health and working ability. Every year the tragic price of the "perestroika-disorganization" exceeds the loss of lives in the many years of the Afghan war by many times. Economically the restoration of capitalism as a whole has already cost the Soviet people dearer than the Great Patriotic War. It is not fortuitous that the "yellow" press hurries to throw dirt and slander on the Victory of the Soviet people in this war.

The struggle between the socialist and anti-socialist forces is all

the more taking on the contents and method of a civil war. All the exertions of M.S. Gorbachev and his group to prevent, stifle, "civilize" or "humanize" this strife show half-way troubled look at the West, which threatens us with such sanctions as the reduction of food supply and "assistance to perestroika".

Blood continues to be shed on an increasing scale. The process of disintegration of the Great Power is progressing. All this is taking place in the situation in which majority of the Soviet people still have no idea of what victims of horrible provocation they are. This was when the laws of restoration of domination of capital over labour still did not begin to function to the full everywhere.

The extreme aggravation of conflicts in our society enables us to size up deeply the political situation which is being created. It is necessary to understand before anything else that the pseudo-democratic cover of "perestroika" ceases to yield the expected fruit even for its "architects" and "schemers". Hence the whirlwind of anti-communism, the intellectuals' grievance at the meeting with the President concerning the disintegrating order, the paralysis of the power, overall impoverishment, the open complaints of servicemen, wavering in the Moscow Soviet, the Leningrad Soviet and other "locomotives" of perestroika, which quite recently destroyed the CPSU, the army and the State Security Commission. Hence, the constitutional idea of Yeltsin concerning the replacement of the Soviet power by the power of presidents and the belligerent-bureaucratic notes in the speeches of Sobchak and other radical-democrats. In my opinion, the change in the consciousness of ideologues of restoration and capitulation shows that we are approaching the critical stage of counterrevolution, which it is becoming difficult not only to disguise but also keep in the civilized forms.

Practice proves that the Soviet Union is not Poland, Hungary nor Czechoslovakia. Our reserves of socialism were more powerful, deeper and better than in the East European countries. The working people doze considerably, in the tens of years long habit of believing in the "tops" blindly, convinced that things will settle down sooner or later. This seemed to me to be one of preconditions of social apathy deriving from the national Slav indolence, a certain passiveness in the face of the growing menace to the motherland. This was taken into account by the opportunists, the agents of homegrown neo-bourgeoisie and the conductors of restoration-perestroika from abroad. Such calculation is grounded on the sand in the long run, I think. The laws governing class struggle are inexorable. Lenin and Stalin were foreseers, warning that with advance to socialism class struggle not only changes its form but also in certain conditions can become acuter in the "classic style".

Vehement polarization of social forces which is taking place in the Soviet Union makes it possible to draw the conclusion that there are two real ways out of the deepest crisis: Bolshevization of the

CPSU, destruction of counterrevolution and strengthening of the state of the working class and its allies (dictatorship of proletariat as called before), or going over to the dictatorship of bourgeoisie of authoritarian-fascist type. In other words, socialism or fascism. There is no third way. Until our "young capitalism" plunders people to the skin, it does not keep still. In a speech at the meeting between the President and men of culture, actor A. Batalov aptly set "young capitalism" against the Western "handcuffed capitalism" and called upon them to forge such "handcuffs of law" to place on our home-grown capitalism, the law, according to A. Batalov, which would "oblige the entrepreneurs to respect people".

Is there a limit to the political naivete and ideological virginity of our elite intellectuals waiting obsequiously for the "sacred word" of the President? One may ask the "outstanding" representatives: Who forged these "handcuffs" for the overpowered robber, so to speak, Western capitalism? Aren't they the European and American workers fighting against social oppression? Wasn't the world socialist system for the last half a century one of the smithies where these "handcuffs" were forged? Isn't Marxism-Leninism the scientific "technology" of class struggle tested in the practice of class struggle which made it possible to "forge handcuffs" for oppressors successfully? And that in the conditions in which international imperialist brutes show missile-nuclear teeth. But this global "prose" about socio-political being will suffice. Let us return to the affair of the motherland.

In what direction is the political process proceeding in our country, the Soviet Union? Today this question excites all at home and abroad. In my opinion, the hand of political barometer of the so-called democratic reform recently moved sharply rightward, toward the side of reaction and fascism. Anti-communism which is strengthening its position now emerges in our society as the straight road leading to fascism in the state and social life, in other words, as the path to deliverance of ideology and policy from the all bourgeois-liberal elements of the proclaimed perestroika. In the journalist writings about perestroika the roots of ominous phenomenon are attributed to national traditions, social psychology, morals, Russian uncivilization and backwardness from immemorial time. But solution here, in my opinion, lies in another, namely, in going over to the society of "free entrepreneurs" with the presence of socialist quality of the main productive forces—the working people whom it was difficult to chain to the capitalist economic relations.

It is known that restoration of capitalist relations itself requires the dictatorship of the entrepreneur class particularly in the cruel authoritarian form. This social class does not like the Utopian. In our days the capitalizers of socialism, homegrown Soviet bourgeoisie, "shady elements," speculators, cambists arrived at the anti-human conclusion on the disastrous effect of following all kinds of Utopia

concerning overall well-being. The world divided into the rich and the poor, the oppressors and the oppressed, masters and slaves fully suits them.

In what does this reactionary tendency manifest itself? Above all in the spread of extreme forms of nationalism and chauvinism, setting nations and nationalities against one another and in proclaiming the supremacy and "leading" status of ones and subjugation, low status and "inferiority" of others. The essence of such world outlook lies in the negation of secondariness of the "national question" to the class struggle of the exploiters and the exploited. Only by convincing the population depoliticized in the years of depression that the authorities hold national interests higher than the class interests of the working people, can nationalists pursue their separatist traitorous policy for collapse of the Soviet Union.

In practice this dangerous reactionary tendency is particularly pronounced in the Baltic republics where in the legislation of the Supreme Soviet the native population is set against the Russian speaking people to whom the nationalists create unbearable living conditions. It is notable that in the Baltic republics the former fascists, Hitlerite lackeys, local SS-men, Gestapo hangmen regard it as halo to have been "victims to Stalin's repression" and are called national heroes and are granted the rights of the participant in the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against German fascist invaders. The next is the return to them of the estates and real property thrown away during the offensive of the Soviet army.

Nationalism of Baltic, Moldavian, Caucasian and middle-Asian republics disgraced them by bloody crimes from which the Soviet army men and the working people of different nationalities suffered. Because of its fault the economic links between republics are broken, language difficulties and strifes between nationalities are provoked. Proceeding from bourgeois-nationalist position, its ideologues are reconsidering the history of peoples and altering the frontier of republics, propagandize nationalist animosity to their neighbours. The centres of planned armed struggle are created and strengthened, anti-communist and anti-Soviet hysteria is brought to the extreme and forms of civil war vary.

Another manifestation of shift of our country to reaction is fascist groups emerging in many places and the growth of influence of monarchical organizations. It is paradoxical that in the country which lost more than twenty millions of its citizens in the struggle against fascism there are fancies showing off their SS uniform and band with swastika. Here all cannot be explained by the expense of political education. It is favourable to some people that the fascist misanthropic ideology gripped the hot heads of "perestroika" supporters and the young people corrupted by it. This is the "reserve variety" of reaction having apparently faked character for the time being. But who will predict how it will "develop" in the future? To

close eyes to this means to betray those who laid down their lives in the anti-fascist struggle.

After a short ideological treatment in mass media monarchical organizations in the disguise of pseudo patriotism lawfully streamed to the political arena. This stream was joined by the ultra "Leftist" anti-Soviet "democrats" from the most reactionary groups of the disorganized "Memory". In the tsarist field of anti-Sovietism and anti-communism there appeared an impressive tandem of nationalists-Zionists and great power chauvinists, as if forgetting the recent noisy race course of Russophile and Russophobia.

Together with the influential press organs the monarchical "white" idea is now supported not only by foreign and "catacomb" church but also by the official Orthodox Church which scores points on the political scaffold of perestroika. It is an irony that neo-monarchists fuss about the heir to the throne and demand that at the reception in the Supreme Soviet they be called "Your Excellency". But it can be seen that the cult of monarch of "all Russia" was designed to defend the pretenders to new-emerging landlords and capitalists. Historical memory hints to some people that an absolute monarchy was the worst machinery for securing political power for Russian gentlemen. They would like to forget the endless bloody crimes of the tsarist autocracy which converted the country into the hereditary estate of foreign capital.

And at last the introduction of presidency was the specious formation of extreme authoritarianism and cult. "Democrats" who are in favour of perestroika do not hesitate to clamour about the necessity of "tsar" as an earnest of victory over "administration-command system". They intuitively understood that it is impossible to ride into the capitalist paradise with the Soviets as on a white horse because they can function only as power organs for the working people. Here only the anti-Soviet nag the role of which can be played by the moss-grown constituent assembly or, in the opinion of "live prophet" Boris Yeltsin, by Presidents and their deputies can serve as a Trojan Horse. Of course, it may be refuted on the ground that presidency as the form of government and power can be filled with different social substances. It is right. But if the counterrevolutionary process gains strength, this state form can be filled only with anti-communist reactionary-authoritarian substance. And that even if the President is the "leader" of the CPSU.

It seems that transition to presidency in our country meant "palace" coup d'etat, Judas-like gallop bypassing the expression of the will of the people, without referendum and earnest debate. When the internal situation of the country became worse after the introduction of presidency, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR strengthened the President's plenary powers and then on the waves of demagogy and political twaddle in the end of 1990 there began transition to the presidential form of state administration. In the last draft Constitutions of the USSR and the RSFSR there are suggested the ideas of Declaration of Independence of the United States (!), which served as the savanna for wining over workers and peasants in October 1917. The President's power signified the beginning of collapse of the Soviet power or desovietization of the political system.

Flurried at the growth of resistance of the working people to the capitalization of society, the "democratic" neo-bourgeoisie, the "Soviet" neo-bureaucracy of Yeltsin and Sobchak company and Right opportunist party-bureaucrats offered absolute power to the General Secretary-President indulging in hypocrisy, who now lords it over their representatives under the red flag with a sickle and a hammer. It seems impossible to conceive more satire on the "renovation of socialism", "communist prospect", the "Soviet power" and "full democracy"! And no one is going to conceive. Historian A. Kiva, bitter opponent of "Marxist fundamentalism" insists in the *Izvestia*, "At the present spiral of our movement without the CPSU it is impossible to go over to market economy smoothly without cataclysms". For the purpose the restorationists need the proletarian symbol and socialist phraseology for the time being. Do not they hurry to place the working class and all its party into the rank of naive youngsters?

Independent of who personally now occupies the "throne" of the General Secretary-President, the introduction of the Presidential administration in the present form, in my opinion, can only promote the changeover of the anti-communist groups of the restorationist forces into a military coup from the "above" some indications of which were already seen in the press. "In the heat of radicalism," the observer of newspaper *Rush Hour* says, "some democrats call upon us to put an end to the democratic structure of the state without all kinds of democratic procedure". Where is the guarantee that in the wake of the bankruptcy of the Soviets of perestroika of "Rukhov-Sayudist" or Popov-Sobchak type the "autocratic presidency" itself will not collapse with all array of its new political structure? There is not and cannot be guarantee. The process of restoration of capitalism in our country is becoming all the more antagonistic and morbid contrary to all the lamentation about "humanism", appeal for "civil peace" and "social concord".

Today the armed forces, the troops and organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the State Security Commission of the USSR are the important bastions of socialism. Particularly, one of the indicators of shift of restoration process to the extreme form of reaction is the increasing provocative raids of military objects and murder of servicemen not only in Nagon Karabakh, Namangan or in the Baltic republics but also in several regions of the RSFSR. These sparks of skirmishes of the "alternative" socialist forces can burst into flames of fratricidal civil war in certain conditions if military formations of extremists are not rendered harmless in time. Is it not simpler to pre-

vent the formation of these counterrevolutionary groups?

The "new political thinking" attempts to complement and "enrich" the disorganization of the internal political life of the country in the process of perestroika with direct participation in the entanglements of the new dangerous knots of the international crisis. Thus, in the Near East world community was anew brought to the brink of a big war the consequences of which it is hard to predict. Minister of Foreign Affairs Shevardnadze will not tolerate that the USSR finally lose the role of a great power, guarantor of stability and peace in the world. Voting in the Security Council together with the United States for the application of the armed forces against Iraq leads to the impairment not only of long friendship of the Soviet and Arabian people but also of our relations with the Muslim's world as a whole to our regret. Here we were less far-sighted than the Chinese who abstained from voting.

The "new world order" imposed by Bush and Gorbachev is fraught with lethal menace to the country of the third world and all the humanity. We, for example, cannot help but be alert to the fact that at the extra session of the Fourth Congress of the People's Deputies of the USSR more than one hundred and fifty "chosen representatives of the people" from the determined democrats voted for the possibility of bringing our armed forces into military action in the Near East in the name of defence of the interests of the United States and Israel. It is known that for a state of "socialist option" participation in the international adventures of imperialism is not only the betrayal of the cause of liberation and anti-imperialist struggle of people but also a foreign policy step toward reaction and the authoritarian dictatorship in the country.

Although many Soviet people already see the reactionary trend of perestroika, the idea of possibility of fascistization seems unacceptable and even blasphemous to the overwhelming majority of people. In our historical memory the image of fascism is, as a rule, identified with a variety of Hitlerite nazism. Of course, direct return to "Fuhrer", "Duce", "Caudillo" and other "early" forms of this shameful socio-political phenomena is hardly possible anywhere. But in our days plenty of its other more modern varieties whose essence is the same as before are possible.

It is known that fascism is the ideology, politics and practice of the most adventurist, brigandish, extremist and terrorist groups of the imperialist bourgeoisie relying on racism, nationalism, chauvinism and misanthropy. Above all in the critical situation it appears on the waves of social demagogy, anarchy and chaos. Its victory is often prepared by the "democrats" who themselves are later "ground down" in the prison and concentration camp together with communists, progressive workers and progressive intellectuals.

Counterrevolutionary crisis is at hand in our country: anti-communism occupies one position after another; radical-democrats who

acceded to power understood at the same time its attractive sweetness and their utter inability to lead the affairs. Hangmen of the state power menace to bring it to collapse! With the thugs taken out of the working rhythm of life through perestroika is formed the "infantry" of future coup d'etat capable of not only destabilizing the situation in the country but also egging the people to seize power, the people whose world outlook, political ambition and practical struggle are incompatible with the bourgeois-liberal projects of the present restorationists of capitalism.

If we endlessly turn our back to the real danger, the political shark fed from the outside will smell a smell of blood and go straight ahead. Today it is not important in principle whom the role of "Fuhrer" is assigned to or who will punish communists and democrats with "iron hand". It is important that he will emerge on the arena when the "main motive force" of perestroika, neo-bourgeoisie badly needs his service. Maybe there is already such a "candidate" and it only remains to him to "reform" in due course? That is also possible. However, don't let us guess. It is needless. Today we have no right not to react to the emergence of the extremely reactionary tendency, not do all in our power to prevent it.

One and a half years ago the All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" warned in its documents that "Socialist fatherland is in danger!" After this we were labeled as "wailers over socialism", "Stalinists", "conservatives", "anti-Semites" and so on. We were attacked with energy deserving to be better employed by the ideological "flag captains of perestroika", members of the Political Bureau and Secretaries of the Central Committee Yakovlev and Medvedev, frightened party staff and intellectuals gamboling in the rays of perestroika, Zionists, pseudo patriots, homegrown constitutional-socialists who in the end distorted Marxism-Leninism in their treatises, nationalists and chauvinists of all hues. How many papers and how much printing ink were then wasted for denial of this obvious reality?

Today the same idea varies in the mouths of the "first persons" of the party and state, in the declarations of ministers and men of culture, in the speeches of delegates to party forums and people's deputies. Anti-communists and anti-Soviet men, the "yellow" press and foreign Sovietologists not only confirm our then conclusion-warning day and night but also outlaw socialism, zealously advocate the necessity of removing its "survivals" in the course of restorationist perestroika. It is very undesirable that the same happens with our warning against the real danger of emergence of reactionary authoritarianism and fascistization of the political life of the country.

I cannot help but share the pain and fear of communist Umalatovaya, the people's deputy of the USSR, who brought up the problem of political distrust to the President at the last congress. Things went so far as that "People have no confidence in tomorrow, there's simply

no one to defend them. You," she said to the General Secretary, "ought to resign for peace and safety of our much suffering country."

To my regret, only one-fourth of the people's deputies present at the congress deemed it necessary to debate this cardinal question. Other statesmen backed out.

It is high time for us to pull down the bureaucratic wall of irresponsibility of the party and state and call those to account by law and by conscience who have brought the country to today's disgrace, who converted perestroika into the anti-communist lever to destroy the great power and opened the sluices for anti-Sovietism, extremism, reaction and fascism.

Lithuanian International Movement
No. 1 for 1991, pp. 2-3

* * *

SYNDROME OF INVOLVEMENT

(Reflection on the Subject of Talks of E.K. Ligachev with the Correspondent of *Soviet Russia* Dated February 6, 1991)

I long looked forward eagerly to this interview with Egor Kuzmich Ligachev whom it is now steadily tried to "stop talking and leave the public stage". I do not conceal that acquaintance with separate chapters of the memoirs of the former member of the Political Bureau carried in *Arguments and Facts* and some local newspapers did not make expected impression on me. Maybe, because they have fragmentary character and are drowned in superfluous details or because unlike Yeltsin's memoirs they are not imparted with the sharp journalistic style of political sensation.

Maybe, the author of the memoirs was too directly guided by his favorite formula of Gertsen "Let us stride forward, looking backward" the meaning of which is by far unequivocal. Maybe, unlike publicistic writing and interview, memoirs are not so much topical in the contemporary ideological struggle, which, of course, does not belittle their great historic significance.

In this respect publication of the talks of E.K. Ligachev in the newspaper *Soviet Russia* apparently much overcomes the limitations of memoirs, actualizes the author's view and makes it possible to judge clearly about his theoretical exposition and political assessment of the present time. Revealing the problems interesting now the Soviet people, Egor Kuzmich traditionally showed himself a theoretician capable of posing pressing problems with utmost accuracy and definiteness, a politician giving precise formulations of the urgent contemporary problems, formulations with which one may agree or not but which one ought to take into account.

Thus, for example, Ligachev is entirely right when he asserts that it is useless to amend errors in politics if not give up such postulates imposed on social consciousness, which is pretentiously called "new thinking", as priority of human interests and assessment over class ones, the "integrity and unity" of our contradictory world, reduction of socialism as social system to the misty "socialist ideas", assertion that V.I. Lenin supposedly radically changed his views on socialism and many others long before his death.

Creatively applying class approach to the analysis of process of perestroika, Ligachev convincingly showed that "The creation of the planned economy was the greatest achievement, a big contribution to the development of human civilization. We destroyed the planned economy and planned economic links, which brought the country to disastrous situation." The author sees in this the basic cause of the collapse of perestroika, which, according to him, in the beginning proceeded very successfully. Egor Kuzmich sees another cause in the lack of stability and continuity in the politics of the CPSU, unwillingness and inability to take from the past what would have consolidated socialism.

All this testifies to the fact, in Ligachev's opinion, that we, "entirely unprepared,... actually began to introduce market mechanism into the planning system of economy", thus destroying it. But in planning itself there are many that are valuable and instructive, particularly in the problems related to the balanced development of the national economy, scientific-technical progress, concentration of forces and means in the main directions, probe of social change and the like.

"Absolute unpreparedness", "organizational, economic and legal" unpreparedness for the enforcement of reforms tolerated by the leadership of perestroika, according to the canons of the world historic practice, is not the errors of Abalkins, Zaslavskayas, Shatalins but, together with them, a crime against the state of the rulers-reformers before the people, a crime which could not be attributed to any "subjectivism" or "voluntarism". The outcome here is every year more than 40,000 victims to economic, political and nationalist banditry, hundreds of thousands wounded and crippled, millions of persons deprived of work and roof. The history of the country yet did not know such nightmare in peace time.

The point here is not only that this sinister experiment, which is called "Gorbastroika" in the brotherly communist parties, was carried out Jesuitically over almost three hundred million Soviet people who believed the leaders of the CPSU, but also that the capitalist perestroika in the Soviet Union turned out a "big defeat of world socialism" in East Europe, the emergence of the unified Germany mined with revanchism and neo-nazism near our frontier which annexed the German Democratic Republic, self-liquidation of the reliable European shield for our security–the Warsaw Pact–and

strengthening of the forces of imperialism and NATO. It is possible that this "big zigzag in the development of world civilization" may become a starting point of preparation for the third world war which imperialism may start with the invasion of the zone of national-liberation movement in the Near East.

Contrary to the present "architects" and "designers" of perestroika E.K. Ligachev on sufficient grounds stresses that "The class struggle is the cruel reality of our days". Destruction of socialist way of production, undermining of public property as the basis of our system, weakening of the alliance of the working class, peasantry and working intellectuals as the social basis of the Soviet state, conversion of a number of the Supreme Soviets of republics and local power organs into the enclaves of anti-communism and the hotbed of restoration of capitalism brought to economic domination and to the foreground of politics "the class of exploiters and shady elements who have their politicians, ideologues and representatives in parliaments".

Calling upon the Soviet people to be vigilant and not yield to deception, Egor Kuzmich convincingly showed that now the question is not the demarcation between the Left and the Right and between radicals and conservatives but the direct socio-political confrontation of socialist and anti-socialist forces. Here he justly asserted that persecution of "conservatives" was nothing else than "prudent maneuvring designed to divert the attention of the party from the main danger, mislead the public opinion and lay detonators to destroy the Soviet Union and undermine the foundation of the CPSU". It must be admitted that the main helmsman of this manoeuvre, the former member of the Political Bureau, A.N. Yakovlev was much successful on his dishonorable field.

Owing to the election law concocted hastily by pseudo democrats and the manipulation of social consciousness it was possible to undermine the political foundation of our society–the Soviets from which are zealously removed the representatives of workers and peasants, and Soviets in a number of places converted into parliamentary talking-shops and ceased to defend the interests of the working people, which deprives the Soviet state of the former support of the working people. On the other hand, Soviets turned out useless even as the organs of restoration of capitalism. They are hastily supplemented by the presidential form of government, which rapidly acquires the "autocratic" character and becomes one of the forms of desovietization of the political system.

It is Ligachev's absolute service that he is not evasive and does not keep away as the "architects" of perestroika but directly poses the problem of the legitimacy of founding the "committees, Soviets for the defence of human rights and freedom, public property in the means of production, that is, that which constitutes the basis of the Constitution of the Soviet Union". "Defence of the Constitution", he

stresses, "is not only the right but also the obligation of each citizen". Egor Kuzmich also justly refutes the accusations of pseudo democrats and bourgeois nationalists who present the founding of committees and Soviets of the working people as attack on democracy and legally elected power organs. "Why are not heard the voices of protest of these votaries of democracy when the illegal armed forces are created, the functioning of the Constitution is cancelled and the rights of millions of citizens are restricted?"

Developing his thought, the former member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU justly stressed that new public organizations for the defence of human rights are founded in the collectives of workers within the framework of law. This is not the replacement of the Soviets nor their denial but combined work helping operatively and profoundly to solve vital and sore problems. Here was expressed a very important idea about the possibility of formation of parallel structure by the working people in definite conditions with a view to turning the Soviets to the defence of the gains of October. The weakness of the Committees for National Salvation of the Baltic Republics, in my opinion, is explained by the fact that they are not sufficiently supported by the lower mass political structures which represent the direct interests of the working people. This, in its turn, deprived the republican committees of confidence and determination, which the bourgeois nationalists used for their aim.

In his reply to the questions of the correspondent of the *Soviet Russia* Ligachev formulated a number of valuable ideas. If Gorbachev, Yakovlev, Shevardnadze, Yeltsin and some other his former colleagues in the Political Bureau strive not to remember their "errors" and evade their personification, Egor Kuzmich directly said that he does not free himself of the blame but considers that he is involved in "that destruction which the perestroika policy caused in recent years." This, without doubt, lifts the level of faith in and respect to him as a communist and raises the desire to speak out my approval of or disagreement with his reflections on perestroika.

Particularly in the article under review it is pointed out that on the Political Bureau he did much so that the results of the perestroika policy were less destructive. Moreover, according to him, being disagreed to a number of its aspects, he took such "extraordinary step" as sending letters to the Central Committee of the party. In them he stated his position on the questions of political situation in the country, and the problems related to the international relations, East Europe and other problems of foreign policy.

Today Egor Kuzmich expresses his regret that he failed to convince the leadership, the Political Bureau and the members of the Central Committee in the necessity of wide party discussion of these problems. But there arises question, why did not he, the "second person" in the party, appeal to the masses of communists, the mil-

lions of Soviet people whom the question raised by him vitally concerned? Why have they confined themselves to the secret discussion in the narrow circle of Cheka men? What is behind this–distrust in the masses of people or desire not to wash one's dirty linen in public? Certainly such secrecy of the tops conduced to it that politicization of the population depoliticized by stagnation is carried out not by the sound forces in the party which are devoted to the motherland but by the "philistines in power"–as they are now called in non-parliamentary manner among the people–who seized mass media in their hands. Leaping "from Kolchak to Sobchak" recently, they, without choosing expression, make a slashing attack on socialism, the CPSU, the Soviets, the unique Soviet Union and mock the army, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, State Security Commission and other state protection establishments and throw mud at veterans and all those who do not share their views.

In 1987 I had an occasion to talk with one of now late members of the Central Committee of the CPSU. When fears about some doubtful aspects of perestroika were expressed, he replied that in the Political Bureau works a staunch, reliable principled party member Egor Ligachev on whom it is always possible to depend. Now I am surprised to read the pages of memoirs in which is portrayed, unfortunately, not a prominent figure of communist movement but rather the former high-ranking party worker depressed by injustice who was helpless in the face of the augmenting restoration of capitalism, the politician who does not take it into consideration that now not explanation and excuses in the memoir but concrete steps for organization and uniting of the working people are needed.

The feelings of "responsibility and involvement" prevented E.K. Ligachev from being consistent to the end in solving the posed problems, I think. In my opinion, his critical analysis of restoration of capitalism in our country did not cover the first half of the period of five-year plans of perestroika. Particularly there remained pseudo-scientific phraseology of perestroika with curses on "administrative-command system" and "Stalin regime" and with praises on the notorious "planned market economy", which as academician Shatalin aptly pointed out, cannot exist in nature. By market the advocates of perestroika meant precisely the capitalist market from the beginning.

It seems that for the rehabilitation of the country it is necessary to "go back" not to 1987 but thirty years more at the least, of course, not mechanically directly but dialectically, retaining all the valuable that was accumulated by society on this path. In other words, in a spiral, coming out each time on a new coil where continuity and innovation are inseparably related, to "go back" to take a flame but not ashes from the past.

The essence of situation, in our opinion, lies in that toward the end of the '50s in our economic mechanism the structural link which is called market actually weakened. In other words, the sphere of

functioning of commodity-money relations. The basic defect of their present functioning does not lie in that our "market" does not work as it ought under capitalism, but in that it does not as it ought under socialism. In this direction it needed perfection after the period of stagnation when the principle of distribution according to labour was flagrantly violated.

Further, giving a detailed account of the present class confrontation in society, E.K. Ligachev, unfortunately, does not lead the recognition of class struggle to the necessity of dictatorship of proletariat, in other words, the state of the working class and its allies which openly confronts the reviving Soviet bourgeoisie. This problem is not theoretical one breathed by the behests of Lenin but rather practically political one. It is time to save people from the illusion that our country will stride from socialism directly to the Swedish, Danish or Netherlandish model of liberal-bourgeois sense with the prospect of being converted into some hybrid of "global community". In reality, if such "transition" takes place, its result in our country will be rather Right-totalitarian pro-fascist regime. Varieties of this are now being "worked out" in Baltic countries and other regions where restorers met and experienced how it is difficult to shackle the Soviet people in the chains of capitalist social relations. Such restorationist outcome can be prevented only by the state power of the working people, above all, the working class, which are interested in its "human" and "humanitarian" character more than any others.

And finally Egor Kuzmich seems to have lost objectiveness when he proceeded from the general analysis of the causes of catastrophic situation in the economy, politics and ideology to those who are directly responsible for this tragedy of the great people. According to old memory he in a fatherly manner reproves Gorbachev for liberalism, insufficient steadfastness and consistency, which, in his opinion, prevented the President from successfully fulfilling his duties. But is this the point? Lenin said, "The question of steady course, boldness and determination is not the personal question but the question of the class capable of displaying boldness and determination.... Boldness and determination of power, its steady course is nothing else than the dictatorship of proletariat."* Many, having a bitter taste of perestroika and not realizing its essence, now dream about such "dictatorship" under which all the social problems will be solved with confidence by the working people and in their interests and robbery of the wealth of the country by the fat cats of perestroika will be decisively frustrated.

The recent opinion poll which was fairly representative revealed that more than 89 per cent of the respondents in our country completely negatively assessed the activity of Gorbachev. Majority among the rest disapproves only his domestic policy. This testifies to it that the rating of the President is steadily decreasing toward

zero and the day is not far off when only Raisa Maksimovna remains his supporter. There arises question, will the negative assessment of the activity of Mikhail Sergeyevich not be automatically carried over to the whole party represented by him as the General Secretary? This enraged philistine impudently wants all the communists to repent themselves and sprinkle their heads with ashes. But this is only one side of the matter.

The other side is that Ligachev's assertion that "It is absurd to doubt and moreover to accuse the President of dictatorship" would be premature at any rate. It is necessary to point out that "autocratic" presidency with its limitless power and right to the selection and assignment of cadres to all state posts objectively create in our country necessary and sufficient preconditions for Right-totalitarian dictatorship of different colouring up to brown. It is another matter whether the present President can take advantage of the dangerous possibility or some other's "iron hand" will intercept it and more resolutely begin to give out the disputable territories to neighbours and is not ashamed of "soiling hands" in the name of restoration of capitalism and satisfying the whims of foregin benefactors.

Egor Kuzmich, unfortunately, passed by another very important problem which directly concerned him as the former secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU who recently together with Yakovlev was responsible for ideology. In mid-January the General Secretary made a speech at the session of the Commission for Preparation of New Programme of the Party. His report was entitled *Toward the New Sight of Social Progress*. In this report Gorbachev hypocritically covered up his deviation from Marxism-Leninism with "innovative decisions", which lay in the recognition of private property in the means of production and exploitation of man by man, in refutation of the division of the world into the socialist and capitalist ones, in denial of the real historical antagonism between socialism and capitalism as the motive force of social progress, in refusal to consider monopoly capital as the main reactionary force of the modern time, which more than once brought mankind to the brink of nuclear-missile self-destruction.

As a matter of fact, the General Secretary set forth main propositions of new programme, but not already of the Lenin-type party but the programme of the liberal-bourgeois party or Right social-democratic party which gave up Marxism. The right of final selection of one of the two mentioned "models" was offered, of course, to commissions and the congress entirely democratically. This Gorbachev's "innovation" once more elucidated the disgraceful and traitorous path of Right opportunism for conversion of the CPSU, as the Bolshevik party, into the "party of all people" and further through friable social democracy and neo-Menshevism into the party of bourgeois liberals and elite intellectuals. The aim with which Gorbachev occupies the key party post so far, becomes clear. Without social

reorientation of the party and deprivation of its scientific-proletarian basis "Gorbastroika" which threatens to bury the country and the President in the vortex of internecine wars cannot be saved.

It would be also interesting to know the opinion of Egor Kuzmich who does not accept "fraction" and sacredly "maintains the title of communist" on the following question: Will he remain together with the General Secretary in the new liberal-bourgeois party or be faithful to the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the glorious Bolshevik past of the CPSU? The new programme of the party raises this not simple question before many people. This is a tragedy, a way out of which I see in the struggle for Bolshevization of the CPSU and, if needed, in the reconstruction of the Bolshevik party. This problem is now discussed by communists.

I do not know whether E.K. Ligachev will agree with our position, but the grim truth of the present day lies in that any reasonable consolidation of Soviet people on the position of "perestroika-destruction" is impossible. The first condition of activation and uniting of the sound forces in the party and the people is the demand of immediate and unconditional discontinuance of bourgeois-restorative perestroika, removal of Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Pavlov and their "teams" from the leadership, solution of the problem of their responsibility for the robbery of the country, disintegration of the international working-class and communist movement, for the blood and tears of innocent Soviet people, tragedy of hundreds of thousands of communists.

It is now obviously insufficient to regard perestroika as a chain of chance or natural errors, warps, punctures and failures. Bourgeois-restorative counterrevolutionary process has its ideological base in militant anti-communism, guiding and coordinating centres at home and abroad, many familiar "architects" and "designers" who steadily reorganize their ranks. Its strategical aim is not only the restoration of old form of capitalism of the 19th century passed in history but also conversion of the country which was recently a superpower in the world into a demoralized raw-material appendage of modern imperialism ravaged by political and social cataclysms. With this aim the country of Soviets is drawn into the hopeless bondage to world capital.

To take this path means to betray not only the past but also the present and future. This is not to be.

Unity, Nos. 6, 11-17 for March 1991, Riga

*Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 34, p. 206

* * *

On July 13-14, 1991 in Minsk was held the All-Union Confer-

ence of Supporters of Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU. Communists and non-party Bolsheviks were delegated to the conference in Minsk from all parts of the Soviet Union. 553 delegates with the right to vote and 303 invitees and observers took part in the work of the conference. In the conference were represented 12 union republics: Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kirgizia, Lithuania, Latvia, Moldavia, RSFSR, Uzbekistan, Ukraine, Estonia and also 9 autonomies, Krasnodar Territory and 27 regions of Russia. At the all-union conference with the adoption of declaration was formed the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU the supporters of which declared themselves heirs and orthodox successors to the revolutionary-proletarian, Lenin's line in the CPSU.

At the conference N.A. Andreyeva, the chairwoman of the Political Executive Committee of the All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals", delivered report *Arise, the Big Country!*

The All-Union Conference of Supporters of Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU called for convocation of the Extra 29th Congress of the CPSU till the end of the current year, and charged it immediately to begin to organize convocation of party meeting for election of delegates to the congress. There were adopted the decision on founding commission for the elaboration of the programme of the CPSU on the basis of Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU, resolutions *On the Political Distrust to M.S. Gorbachev General-Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU* and *On Recall of People's Deputies from the CPSU*, appeals *To All Communists and Non-Party Bolsheviks* and *To the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union and the Supreme Soviets of Republics*.

ARISE, THE BIG COUNTRY!

Report to the All-Union Conference of Supporters of Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU July 13, 1991, Minsk

Comrades, we gathered at the All-Union Conference of Supporters of Bolshevik Platform to discuss the prevailing critical situation in the country and pressing problems of preparation for the 29th Congress of the party, which, with the adoption of new programme, was called upon by M.S. Gorbachev to put an end to the CPSU as V.I. Lenin's party and finally shift it to the track of Right social democracy or bourgeois liberalism. Today aid to the General-Secretary in this through the movement "for unification of forces of democracy and reform" is offered by A. Yakovlev, E. Shevardnadze, A. Bolsky, A. Rutskoy and his other associates who shortly before decided to found an alternative "supra-party" together with G. Popov, A. Sobchak, S. Shatalin and other former party members and also with the "democratic Russia" group led by N. Trabkin, Russian republicans and social democrats.

Among the participants in our conference together with the delegates of party organizations of republics, regions, districts of the country there are many representatives of the bloc being born in

throes of Leftist forces, societies, movements, political clubs and seminars, patriotic organizations and international fronts. All those who resolutely fight against anti-communism and bourgeois nationalism fight for the victory of socialism and integrity of our Soviet motherland.

Not only like-minded communists are taking part in the preparation and elaboration of the decisions of our conference. As in the years of war the danger menacing our socialist motherland revealed a great number of compatriots who, having no party card in their pockets, showed themselves to be genuine Bolsheviks-Leninists ready to fight for the gains of October, Marxism-Leninism and communist prospect of the country with dignity and honour. To fight not only in word but in deed. The active participation of these comrades in the joint work on the footing of equal right testifies to the genuine unity of the party and the people, the unity which is frenziedly being wrecked by anti-communists and anti-Soviets of all hues who see in it the source of strength and the historic rightness of Bolshevism with grounds.

Today to prove that the country in total crisis is sliding down to national catastrophe means to knock at the open door. Not only the sparrows of the "yellow" press chirp about the impending tragedy in our days but also the President himself speaks, whose service in this is really indisputable. Only those who do not want to see counterrevolution in the country or to whom it is not profitable to see do not see it. The slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" under which the executioners of will of "shady elements", speculators, rapacious cooperatives together with the so-called "influential agents" of the Western special services went to key posts, was put in the archives of perestroika without noise and pity. There proceeds rapid transition to one-man government, which, as pseudo democrats blare, brought everywhere "good times for strong personalities" of new anti-Soviet type who already declared the Soviet power useless.

"Presidents", "prefects", "governors", "mayors" and other executives of Right authoritarian power of "Soviet" neo-bourgeoisie crowded to the political foreground. Premier Pavlov and his ministers are preparing themselves to play the role of the "children to be caned" in the wake of Ryzhkov. The current Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Congress of the People's Deputies of the country which did all to shunt the armored train of counterrevolution to the main line of Gorbachev's perestroika are ignominiously ending their pseudo democratic "sufferings". As is said, Moor did his business, so Moor can go. It is now the turn of republican and other Soviets packed with "willy-nilly politicians" who are losing all contacts with electors. Another round of social betrayal which is now embodied in the "authoritarian principle" was needed. Recently comrades Yazov, Pugo and Kryuchkov justly warned that after a few such successes of perestroika even the Soviet Union would perish as the sovereign

state, but their voices sounded like prattle.

The billow of bourgeois restoration and overall disintegration hit the country, causing often panic mood, particularly after the presidential election in the RSFSR which paved way to reaction and the authoritarian dictatorship. People cannot get rid of the illusion that all that are taking place are only short-lived nightmarish dream. Judge yourselves how our compatriots will react when Lenin's monument is destroyed and when the graves and memory of Soviet soldiers and partisans are defiled. When hostages are disembowelled in south Osetia. When Bukovskys, Voinoviches, Baklanovs, Adamoviches and the like hold forth on the TV screen at state expense that "Socialism of Stalin is worse than national socialism of Hitler". When cries "Communists to gallows!" are raised at the pro-fascist rallies and when memorials to SS men, Banderovites, and "forest brothers" are erected. When outrages are committed against veterans of war and labour and when defenders of the motherland are called "gang of riffraffs", when they accuse the Russian people of all "global disasters of the 20th century", impudently demanding repentance from them. When diplomats recall that Bush, the former director of the CIA, insistently established contacts with Gorbachev long before the latter became the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

Substituting quietly cosmopolitism for patriotism, pseudo democrats are now bringing anti-patriotism to the hatred at their own country. Six years long perestroika orgy of spitting at ourselves converted ours into the most anti-communist state in the world. The Soviet people, indignant, often naively address their protest to where all this anti-Soviet orgy is not only tolerated but also Jesuitically organized.

Obviously it is time to clarify that all this is not excess nor warp but the essence of Gorbachev's perestroika. Now it is time not to be surprised but to realize that we face the ordinary, natural class enemy, who, without choosing means and with powerful support of the West, consistently and steadily is striding toward economic domination and political power. His aim is by no means to "renovate socialism" and make it "democratic and humane".

I particularly stress once again: class enemy, but no competitor, nor rival nor adversary of communists. He is already now ready to perpetrate any crime, prompted by his brutal hatred to communists, to all the Soviet, to "bearings" and "work animals". It is needless to seek the enemy of socialism. They are all revealed in the course of perestroika. It is only necessary to separate them from the fooled masses of people, those who are tightening the noose around their neck.

The intellectuals supported by the enemy of socialism have already prepared the "general ideological space" which serves for mass reproduction of bio-robots-executioners and primitive consumers. Now culture, art, people's education and higher education are eventually reorganized for the reproduction of such models of the "man of the communist future". All this precisely coordinated campaign presents socio-political revanche of imperialism for its past defeats in the struggle with the working people and world socialism.

Counterrevolution is on the offensive. In our view, the recent events related with the working out of the union treaty radically change the prevailing situation. Replacement of the name of socialist republics with sovereign states in the treaty traitorously put an end to the so-called socialist option of perestroika. This happened four months after 76 per cent of the voters in the Soviet Union determined their position as the supporters of the USSR in spite of the cruel pressure of the anti-Soviets. Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Nazarbyev and other reformers fraudulently changed the socialist essence of sovereignty fixed in the Declaration of Formation of the USSR in 1922 to bourgeois nationalism which was promoted to the rank of the official republican policy which is directly opposed to proletarian socialist internationalism.

To avoid misunderstanding I make it more clear that proletarian internationalism has nothing to do with Trotskyite-Zionist, so-called "internationalism of one nation", with which the Jewish trans-bourgeois nationalism camouflaged itself.

The international brotherhood of the Soviet peoples in its Lenin's idea allowed our multi-nationality great power to withstand the bitter trials of the Second World War when states and whole empires collapsed. In the years of perestroika the "sovereignty" of Gorbachev-Yeltsin made the working people shed blood and engendered frenzied national discord, which grew into undeclared wars between republics. The situation was more aggravated by the "rehabilitation of repressed peoples", which developed into another large-scale provocation of the anti-communists and renegades.

The new union treaty is designed not only to put an end to the "vestiges of socialism" but also entirely disintegrate our multinationality motherland, the common house for all peoples inhabiting it, which our forefathers adjured us to consolidate and defend. But this treaty imposed on the country already does not suit the bourgeois-nationalist leadership of six republics. Landsbergises, Gamsakhurdis, Snegurs, Ryutelis, Gorbunovs and Ter-Petrocyans obviously gravitate toward pro-fascist regimes and closer "integration" with international imperialism, striving with the help of Bushes and Mitterrands to undermine the state sovereignty of the USSR and promote our internal problems into the category of international conflicts with the participation of the "UN forces".

It is not surprising that the separatist plans of bourgeois nationalists obtain "interested" understanding from the West, which, for example, threatens to "punish" the Soviet Union in the "manner of

Iraq" if Moscow intends to "conquer Baltic countries". Why? Truth is simple. According to the UN data more than 60 per cent of the world's natural resources and sources of raw materials and energy are found in our motherland. In the condition of their global exhaustion there are always found those who want to become the sole possessors of these resources in our country. No doubt, here all means are good for the modern "civilizers" and "defenders of human rights". It is, so to speak, for the information of those who call for unilateral disarmament and headless conversion of defence potential, using the flimsy arguments thrown in from abroad: "To whom are our 'poverty' and empty counters 'needed'?"

Today imperialists do not need the Soviet Union even as the "colossus on the clay legs". They took the lesson we taught to Hitler. Therefore, they prefer dispersed "sovereign states" over which they may hold sway on the principle: "Divide and rule!" Moreover, heads and envoys of a number of republics stay in the capitals of the "civilized countries", calling upon them to be not only mediators but also sponsors and allies in the struggle against the "centre". It may not be out of place to recall a poem of one Soviet poet which was written before perestroika:

These organisms give out stench as yet
And call to the enemy host for help
Dear our dictatorship
Don't hurry to weaken and disappear.

Conversion of republics into sovereign states which is encouraged by the West and is proceeding on Gorbachev's principle "What is very wanted is lawful" progresses at such fast tempo that soon pursuance of unified all-union policy will be impossible. It is not fortuitous that Baker, State Secretary of the United States, arrived in Yugoslavia to persuade the Slovenian and Croatian separatists to be "lighter at the turn", for this may frighten Gorbachev away in his account to Bush about the progress of perestroika at the next "summit" meeting. To make the President of the Soviet Union more compliant at the Soviet-American talks, against him was unequivocally set the present President of the RSFSR "elected by all the nation for the first time in the one thousand years long history of Russia" who soon after voting hurriedly showed his highest respect for "Uncle Sam". By the way, he did not hesitate to accuse the Soviet military leadership of deceiving the American militarists on the question of the nuclear-missile armament of the Soviet Union. Russia did not know such national disgrace from the time of the Tartar-Mongolian yoke.

It is natural that our conference is incapable of influencing the conclusion of the union treaty. But, we must explain to the people why bourgeois restorers and their foreign partners needed it. In our

opinion, to tide over the crisis it is necessary to renew the Declaration on Formation of the USSR where it is pointed out that "Only in the condition of dictatorship of proletariat which rallied behind it majority of population it became possible to obliterate entirely national oppression, create the atmosphere of mutual trust and lay the foundation of brotherly cooperation of peoples." Do not these tasks now face the party and the country?

The "velvety revolutions" carried out simultaneously in the countries of the former socialist community brought to the helm of the political power the "shady" anti-communist governments formed earlier underground, which soon were held in bondage by the debts amounting to 140 milliard dollars, the bondage which we cannot get rid of in the conditions of so-called "new measure". Bitter disillusionment, mass dissatisfaction, strikes, indignation and rotten eggs thrown at the heads of new rulers of East European countries now cannot change the created situation.

Our state is pushed to that path. According to foreign source, the financial debt of the Soviet Union constitutes about 70 milliard dollars and it has nothing to pay the increasing interest for the debt. By the way the overwhelming proportion of the debt was incurred after 1985, which now becomes a menace to the political independence of the state in face of transnational monopolies. Now the "leaders" of our perestroika and their followers like Yavlinsky are bringing the debt to 150 milliard dollars. If it is counted in rubles by the free market rate, the total debt to the West will run into the astronomical figure of 5-6 trillion rubles. With this the foreign new riches will be able to "appropriate" almost all basic material-production base of the country and the lion's share of its natural resources.

It seems to me that now we must think not only about the rout of bourgeois restoration but also about removal of disastrous consequences of restorationists and capitulationists at home and abroad. I think our conference must openly warn all foreign debtors and taxpayers that the supporters of the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU advocate refusal to pay all the debts granted to counterrevolution. Let the sponsors and "benefactors" of Gorbachev's perestroika pay them back.

It is necessary to point out that bourgeois restorationists together with the political and ideological spokesmen of their interests in the CPSU, power organs and mass media act under the slogans of liberty, democracy and glasnost to which human but, in essence, bourgeois class meaning and substance are formally imparted. Already Engels warned that "after seizure of power by the proletariat all its opponents and all reactionary forces will be united under the slogan of pure democracy." But does "pure democracy" exist in the society divided by private property into antagonistic classes?

Can unemployment and mass impoverishment, for example, be considered as "economic feedom"? This is the freedom for newly emerging stockbrokers, entrepreneurs, businessmen and speculators,

to plunder and expropriate. For millions of the working people the notorious appropriation which was recently legalized means their subjugation to the interests of "resourceful" swindlers and filchers. To distract attention the working people are induced to participate in sharing all-people's property. But this heritage, Ivan Vasilev points out, does not belong to "appropriators"–advocates of conversion of all people's property into private property. It is "the property of the nation, and to convert it into private property means to share others' property or to plunder posterity".

It is paradoxical, but in our country all-people property, the economic base of socialism, entirely is not protected. However, the overwhelming proportion of this property did not come to us from autocracy and expropriation. It was created by the collective dedicated labour of the people and belonged to all people from the beginning. Therefore none has right to "appropriate" it. But this right was "delegated" to Sobchaks, Popovs, different commissions and sub-commissions. Journalist Vasilev rightly said that conversion of all-people property into private property is robbery, moreover, robbery not only of posterity but also of the living working people, the genuine masters of all-people property. What right, for example, had Sobchak to sell the French firm the islet in the centre of Leningrad for 99 years? This is an act of colonization.

In the policy "pure democracy" of perestroika turned out the power of crowd, lawlessness, anarchy, and in the sphere of international relations, it deprived tens of thousands of people of the right to live. On society is imposed the aggressive immorality which played not the last role in the appearance of the "lost generation" of youth, the youth that are educated in the spirit of falsification of the Soviet history and anti-communism for six years, are crammed with pornography, fed with the low-rate masterpieces of foreign mass culture, instilled with individualism and greed for gain and are set against the old generations.

The press and art of perestroika crazy with obsequence and subservience are showing the young people betrayers, apostates, supermen, international prostitutes, deserters and thieves in the capacity of heroes of our times. The outcome is tragedy with the protracted consequences, which are now successfully used by Yeltsinites and Zhirinovskyites.

The mass media seized by anti-communists instill in us that precisely restorationists are acknowledged leaders and that they receive support from the population who are looking forward to capitalist orders for 70 years and even monarchy with impatience. In confirmation of this the results of election campaign and opinion polls are adduced. But, for example, barely 65 per cent of electors took part in voting for presidency in the RSFSR. This clearly characterizes extremely low activeness of the Soviet people in the by-no-means harmless election farce. For example, owing to the ambiguously

framed questions in the enquete many Leningrad citizens so far do not know and did not understand for what they voted, for Leningrad or for Saint-Petersburg. The party press more than once warned the electors of this "small ruse" of Sir Sobchak and "democratic" Leningrad Soviet, but not all now read the party newspapers.

The current level of development of mass media makes it possible to manipulate fully effectively social consciousness, orientate it in any direction. "Capitalizers" of all hues excellently took advantage of this so-called "fourth power" in society.

Let me here refer to the social statistics which is framed in the spirit needed for the "modelers" in modeling the political mood. The social probe designed to "win the hearts" of credulous people plays the same role for the restorationists. What those in authority want to receive is probed and predicted. This enabled manipulators to create the semblance of all-people's support.

It seems to me that the actual indicator of the relations of the Soviet people to perestroika, its genuine aims, "architects" and "designers" is their actual attitude to labour, public obligation, laws and presidential decrees, the state and people's property. Their attitude is now objectively revealed in the decline of production, public, executive and military discipline, growth of crimes and vandalism, increase of public indifference or mass protest. Today these phenomena have so far unrecognized and spontaneous character, but with aggravation of crisis, spiral of inflation and growth of unemployment and poverty the situation will, without doubt, change and socio-political protest will assume more organized and conscious character. Hence feverish invention of "social shock absorbers" and "brakes" in parliaments and powerless rage of aggressive attack on communists and patriots in the "yellow" press.

If in our days the economic, political and ideological foundations of constitutional structure are wrecked and ruined in a planned and organized manner with the participation of "influential agents" of foreign secret services, this directly concerns all communists and honest Soviet people who are not fooled by anti-communist propaganda. Of course, above all, it concerns judicial workers and Cheka men who have no right to forget their class-political mission bequeathed by Lenin and Dzerzinsky in any case. Now it is a question of not some notorious "heretical view" but of the concrete anti-state deeds of Banderovites, Vlasovites, Basmaches, bourgeois nationalists and also their present political successors. Can it be safely said that some of them do not act on the instructions of foreign intelligence services?

The Soviet Cheka men have the emblem "shield and sword" known all over the world, which means the defence of the gains of the great October and the socialist structure born of it. I reiterate: defence of constitutional socio-political structure but not of somebody's "personal honour". More so when it is taken into account

that the honour was lost on our political Olympus where the leading dignitaries openly or disguisedly advocate capitalist "paradise". It is inadmissible that the "shield and sword" of socialism is converted into properties. It is more inadmissible that multiplied presidents-anti-communists use them for anti-national purposes.

In my opinion, it is difficult to imagine Cheka men without politics because provision of the state security is entirely a matter of politics.

"Castration of party leadership" here is only the first step to "depoliticization" of the army and the State Security Commission organs of the Soviet Union. Yeltsin particularly strenuously insists on it. To take this path means to imitate the former General Kalugin and his predecessor pseudo Cheka man Shevardnadze under whom little fishes of the shady economy of Georgia were briskly caught for show but sharks of underground business together with Gamsakhurdis and other dissidents-anti-Soviets were left untouched.

According to the information at our disposal, in Bulgaria and our other allies Cheka men made public the documentary data about the total sum in dollar, pound, mark the opposition groups of "democrats" received on the eve of counterrevolutionary coup. It would be useful to publish such data concerning our homegrown pseudo democracy. It is also necessary to lift the veil from the so-called "secret service" activity of Solzhenitsins, Antonovs-Ovseenkas and other "victims to Stalin's repression" who survived together with the activity of those who not only supplied misinformation but possibly were accomplices in the violation of socialist laws. It is necessary not for idle curiosity but for the right solution in the aggravating struggle between socialist and anti-socialist forces.

Liquidation of socialism in the Soviet Union would have been impossible without the disintegration of the CPSU as Lenin's party of the working class and its allies. And this disintegration began at the boundary of the 60s when the party began to slide down from the proletarian-class position to Right opportunism and social democratism. The Trotskyite-Bukharinite ideo-political "baggage" which was once smashed was revived. Conversion of the CPSU into the "party of all people" was declared when the "shady" economy the turnover of which is now already comparable to the state budget was born and began to function.

Perestroika emancipated the restorative processes, imparting them normal-consistent character and logical completion. The "party of all people" began to develop into the neo-Menshevik petty-bourgeois party orientated to private property, market of capital and hired labour and different forms of non-socialist undertaking. The 28th Congress of the CPSU, using Marxist phraseology, fixed this orientation in the documents not shining with logic. The right of the General Secretary to personally select and assign candidates to high party posts was legalized. The inviable Central Committee and

Political Bureau were elected on the "basis of consensus". The conditions for identifying renegades discrediting socialism and communist ideals with all the CPSU and millions of communists were created. It became more difficult for communists from their conviction to consider themselves the members of the party headed by such leadership. Withdrawal from the CPSU for ideological reasons increased. Many wept, handing over party card....

All the tragedy lies in that the anti-national policy of Gorbachev's perestroika so far is carried out in the name of the CPSU. Therefore, the disintegration of the economy, the great power, overall bedlam and chaos are attributed to communists. At their rallies "democrats" cry out, "Communists reduced the country to this status." Unfortunately, even the newspaper *Pravda* is in no hurry to clear up this question, although its editorial staff know well who in the Central Committee of the CPSU is really responsible for the catastrophe. The notorious "democratic public" knows this. "I personally would erect monument to Gorbachev only for it", Academician Amosov says with ecstasy, playing politics, "that he shook the rock-firm communist great power." But for this great power, he would hardly be prominent surgeon and writer. In the best case he would have been entrusted with feeding pigs by some German baron, as the current President.

The "alternative" to Gorbachev's leadership is not "democrats"-communists and businessmen-entrepreneurs supporting them but the party mass, the party itself, which his accomplices obviously fear and therefore feverishly destroy, seeing in it the main obstacle to their capitulationist policy, that is, they fear the party which they head and the "authority" of which they hypocritically use.

In the near future the new draft programme will be made public and be hastily discussed in the plenary session of the Central Committee after a week. The General Secretary said that the commission already worked out five varieties of draft programme. Communists acquainted themselves only with the first variety from which it is clear that the CPSU is converted into liberal-bourgeois or bourgeois-liberal party. What the fifth variety will give is so far unknown. But I think that there will be certain analogy with three varieties of the union treaty when each next variety was more reactionary, which was reflected in the title of draft programmes. In November 1990 it was "union treaty", in March 1991, "Treaty of the Union of Sovereign Republics", and in June already "Treaty of the Union of Sovereign States". Through these varieties we were gradually and persistently brought to the thought of inevitability of the disintegration of the USSR into separate equal-sized territories with different socio-economic structure. As a result, the country received the planned stages of development of coup d'etat which historians will long argue.

In any state Constitution is the basic law. There is nothing above

it. In the United States it has functioned for 200 years and practically did not change. In our country Constitution is steadily revised and supplemented but the main thing is that it is not enforced and violated, incidently, mainly from above. The last draft union treaty generally makes the Constitution dependent on the country of the "Treaty of the Union of Sovereign States", which unequivocally testifies only to the intention to disintegrate completely the Soviet state. The President who, as practice shows, cannot even guarantee the execution of even one of hundreds of his own decrees is called the guarantor of observation of this treaty and the Constitution of the USSR. Who stands to gain by it?

If the union treaty is designed to disintegrate the Soviet state, the new programme ought to liquidate the CPSU as the party of Leninist type. The scientific proletarian ideology tested many times in the class struggle ought to be put in archive, incidently without critically overcoming Marxism-Leninism but simply throwing it away for passing considerations as the world outlook incompatible with the interests of the "masters of new life". Many varieties of the new draft programme of the CPSU testify to ever more deviation from the programme adopted five years ago. Why did so fast become obsolete the programme of the party now in force which was worked out under the leadership of the current General Secretary? Was the "main drafter" not reliable? What price have then such party programmes if they ought to be changed every five years? At the next plenary session of the Central Committee anyone ought to raise this question.

According to the scheme of strategists of perestroika from the party bureaucrats several varieties of draft party programme ought to testify to the "new democratism in the party" and "power of the party lower echelon". Actually this is a cunning scheme to "wear out" the discussants with subtleties and details and with terms and words so as to carry the main thing through under the veil without any fuss, that which makes Gorbachev and his company grave-diggers of socialism and liquidators of the CPSU and participants of the party forums their accomplices. Such pseudo democratic method is very tempting and viable. For example at the last stage of the Initiative Congress three similar draft programmes of the CPSU were discussed so that discussion was nearly brought to deadlock and almost ended with the split of the congress, although there was no objective preconditions for this.

The prospect of not being in the party which one joined became the reality of the near future. Ideological demarcation in the CPSU has already taken place. On the list of priorities is political demarcation the essence of which is the aggravating antagonism between the socialist and anti-socialist forces in society. Demarcation was caused by the intensification and deepening of inter-party struggle, which communists-Leninists wage against Left and Right social democrats,

bourgeois liberals, nationalists and social betrayers. Artificial delay in such demarcation served the anti-communist fraction of Gorbachev and helped it remain in leadership. covering itself with socialist phraseology.

The Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU which is discussed at our conference ought to serve the strengthening of the position of Marxists-Leninists.* It is now regarded as one of the five basic inter-party trends in the CPSU together with the "initiators", Marxist platform and supporters of Gorbachev's programme of the CPSU and "democratic platform". Our views coincide with the Marxist platform in many respects and particularly with "Initiators", though they have, in our opinion, more radical and consistent character. This frightens some of their leaders and theoreticians tending to compromise and maneuvering in problems of principle. Today the objective necessity of unity of the Leftist forces of Marxist-Leninist orientations is recognized by all of us. The Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU gives new impetus to the strengthening of this unity, the political unity, which by no means implies uniformity but retains all the peculiarities of the mentioned trends.

Quite different is the attitude of the supporters of Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU to the "floating" and camouflaged anti-communism of the "democratic platform" and Gorbachev's fraction in the CPSU. Here our ideo-political positions are incompatible. "Consensus" is excluded. We intend to wage struggle for the return of the Communist Party to Leninism and Bolshevism. The supporters of the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU support the decisions of the All-Union Conference of the Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" (October 1990) and the congress of Initiative Movement of Communists (June 1991) together with the demands for the convocation of the Extra 29th Congress of the CPSU till the end of the current year, removal of the anti-communist fraction of Gorbachev from the leadership of the party and the country and calling it to account to the party.** I think now we ought to concentrate our attention on the preparation of this congress itself so that Gorbachevites do not convert it into another renegades' forum as it happened more than once.

In the correspondence and talks with the communists of some former socialist countries and a number of capitalist countries the question of unifying Marxists-Leninists internationally in the framework of the world communist movement was raised on their initiative. In other words, it is the question of refounding Comintern in the contemporary conditions, in the conditions of offensive of reaction and counterrevolutionary forces in all the perimeter of world struggle. The problem is very complicated. It requires detailed scrutiny, procuring of sources of financial support and, what is important the base state the function of which the USSR fulfilled till 1943. Arrangements were made to keep bilateral contacts. Certainly

it will be useful to discuss this question at the current conference of the supporters of the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU. Incidently, this draft platform is republished by communists abroad.

At the conference we should decide whether we are to have all-party discussion about our draft programme of the CPSU, which in the near future will be worked out on the basis of the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU or from tactical considerations to support the draft programme born in throes at the last "Initiative" Congress. Many comrades who took part in the work of this congress speak about the level acceptable for us of this programme. In the course of discussion some details may be made more precise.

Here we also ought to select active, authoritative and communicative communists, elect the Organizational Committee on which will be devolved not only the big task of organizing preparations for the 29th Congress but also coordination of all diverse activities of the supporters of the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU.

Gorbachev's perestroika divided the Soviet people into the rich and the poor and it is not admissible that it divides all of us into the living and the dead. Today the future of the party, the country and world socialism much depends on our principled Bolshevik position and activity. We are not Gorbachevites but the successors to the revolutionary proletarian traditions of the CPSU. The working people of the country ought to be aroused to the repulsion of the destroyers of the socialist motherland and to prevent pseudo democrats and restorationists from fooling people. Decisive counteraction of party-members-Leninists ought to be organized against each sally of counterrevolution.

Let us convert the 29th Congress of the CPSU into the congress of victory of historical justice of the cause of October. Socialism was and will be victorious in the global struggle with international capital! However difficult it may be now, our Stalingrad is in store for us! Our cause is just! The future is for communism!

We Will Emerge Victorious under the Immortal Banner of Lenin!

---

* The formation of the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU pursues the aim of returning to the CPSU the organizational-political character and ideo-moral role of the advanced detachment of the working people of our country in the struggle for realizing their class interests conditioned objectively and historically, that is, for the building of socialist and communist society. With this aim we intend to unite all sound, progressive, socialist and patriotic forces existing at the present in our society and, on this basis, decisively rebuff the bourgeois counterrevolution sweeping over our socialist motherland more dangerously and dramatically with each passing day.

The Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU

** As pointed out in the Appeal to All Communists and Non-party Bolsheviks adopted at the conference:

At the extraordinary party congress there ought to be represented the communists who are capable of:

- Turning down Gorbachev's perestroika as the anti-national capitulationist policy which has already brought the country to the nationwide catastrophe with the near future prospect of complete disintegration of the USSR into the "hereditary sovereignties" and conversion of the motherland into the semi-colony of the West;
- Calling M.S. Gorbachev and his circle to account to the party for the disintegration of the CPSU and the Soviet state and for the betrayal of the cause of Lenin, October and the international communist and working-class movement;
- Assessing the situation in the party and in the country from the party-class position and working out on the scientific basis the principled new policy of the CPSU which expresses the basic interests of the working people and is orientated to saving the motherland from the crisis and to the restoration of the former might of our multinationality state, the policy securing for socialism success in the peaceful competition with the capitalist system;
- Electing the new leadership of the CPSU which can implement the party policy to be worked out by the extraordinary 29th Congress of the CPSU;
- Branding with infamy all the betrayers, apostates and turncoats who defected to the anti-communist camp and particularly the former members of the Political Bureau A. Yakovlev, E. Shevardnadze, E. Primakov and B. Yeltsin for the edification of posterity.

* * *

On September 21, 1991 in Krasnoe Selo near Leningrad was held the conference of Leningrad organization of the All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" jointly with the members of the Organizational Committee of the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU, the representatives of Moscow, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Siberia, Vladivostok and other regions of the country.

At the conference were discussed the problems of the aggravation of political situation in the country after the August events of 1991 in Moscow and the tasks of speeding up preparations for the Constituent Congress of the party of Bolsheviks-Leninists.

The conference heard and discussed the report of N.A. Andreyeva, Chairman of the Organizational Committee of the Bolshevik Platform "Hostile Whirlwind Blows over Us" and carried a decision to hold the Constituent Congress of the Bolshevik Party in mid-November 1991.

HOSTILE WHIRLWIND BLOWS OVER US

Report to the Conference of the Leningrad Organization of the All-Union Society "Unity", September 21, 1991

The dramatic events of August 19-21 , becoming the culmination of the nationwide crisis in the Soviet Union, converted the catastrophe of future possibility into the law-governed reality. Now arguments about the nature, character and causes of these events were held everywhere. It seems to me that it is the time for us to express our views on these problems. Particularly the myths of official propaganda and the "yellow" press leading away from the truth oblige us to do so.

The opinion that seizure of power, coup d'etat and even military coup, took place on August 19-21 is imposed on us. Does this corre-

spond to reality? It entirely does not, I think. How can one say about the seizure of power when the members of the State Emergency Commission and their supporters in the leadership of the country practically had unlimited power before August 19 ? The members of the State Emergency Commission actually represented almost all the Security Council of the Soviet Union. They included Vice-President discharging the duties of the President, Prime-Minister, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet and leading ministers.... In other words, each of them and all of them had no need to seize power. It can be said only about its application and use.

Even attempt at coup d'etat on their part was not noticed. The documents published by the "eight" testify to it that perestroika came under real threat since it "is at a deadlock on account of a number of causes". Who now can dispute their assertion that the "development of the country should not be made on the basis of fall of the living standards of population"? Isn't it necessary to stop "all attempts to speak with our country in the language of a dictator", and counter encroachment on "our sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity"? Where is here the violation of Constitution? I suppose that the plan of action to save the country from crisis proposed by the State Emergency Commission in its first resolution can be considered only as the correction of perestroika without change of its restorationist essence of capitalization. Hence the confirmation of the State Emergency Commission at the press conference on returning Gorbachev to the execution of his duties in near future....

Before using the term "putsch", let us recall the real putsches, or how generals Franko in Spain and Pinochet in Chile acceded to power. The August events in the Soviet Union entirely lacked the main features which always accompanied putsch wherever it took place. First, political opponents were not neutralized and the system of communication with the White House and other potential centres of resistance was not disconnected. Yeltsin, Popov, Sobchak and others freely spoke through mass media publicly, bitterly accusing the State Emergency Commission.

Secondly, the troops brought into the capital for demonstration of strength were without ammunition and demonstrated lack of power*.

Thirdly, the members of the State Emergency Commission themselves acted unsystematically, hesitantly and continually lingered as if they waited for the directions of someone behind their back whom they believed and whose wishes they carried out.

Fourthly, the "overthrown" President who was placed under "confinement" was allowed to keep all his personal guards. His residence in Foros was guarded from the land and the sea as it usually was during the President's stay in it. No blockade was made. According to the testimony of frontier-guards Majors Degtiarev and Alimov, in these days Gorbachev was seen to bathe in the sea with

his family.

Fifthly, when the "action" failed, the members of the State Emergency Commission had all possibility to fly abroad, though "democrats" prompted them to do so, but they without fear and with confidence went with "report" to the President in Foros.

Sixthly, the newspaper *Businessman* justly stressed that on August 21 it was far from failure, the State Emergency Commission was not in hopeless situation, the "eight" controled the situation, the country did not condemned their programme and none supported Yeltsin's and Sobchak's appeals for indefinite strike. Why did then they give themselves up? It seems, the newspaper writes, that the statesmen obeyed "orders".Who gave orders?

Seventhly, on August 18 all the heads of departments and most of the secretaries of the Central Committee of the CPSU were simultaneously on leave although the complicated situation of the country should have not put the party leadership in the frame of mind to be on mass leave. Was it possible that this collective leave was granted without notice of the General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU? I doubt.

The concrete circumstances which prevailed toward August 19 explain the situation. It is known that on August 20 signatures were to be put on the Treaty of the "Union of Sovereign States" (in essence the treaty of dissolution of the union), which converted the President of the USSR into the like of Shakespeare's King Lear who handed out power and wealth to republics and became a feeble beggar. The leadership of the union or the "centre" as it is called could foresee this catastrophe of the great power and feel the historic responsibility for its consequences. Hence the attempt to slow down the restoration processes with the introduction of a state of emergency. Moreover, it is surprising why the President took a holiday idly in Crimea the day before the signing of the fatal treaty.

The other peculiarity of the situation was that the date of the 29th Party Congress was fixed for November under the pressure of masses of party members, which could deprive Gorbachev of the post of the General Secretary . The state of emergency deferred date of the congress and made it possible to avoid wide discussion of the draft new programme, which converted the CPSU into a mediocre bourgeois-liberal party. In other words, the activity of the State Emergency Commission played into the hands of the President-General Secretary , who, as people's deputies of Russia said, was viable in any development of dramatic events. It is now favourable for the "democrats" to hush up his involvement in them, for otherwise the formal grounds for their assertion about the "crimes of the State Emergency Commission" would be lost and the stage-managed coup of August 19-21 will then be identified as the screen behind which the real anti-constitutional coup was carried out in the country.

Apparently the policy of perestroika ceased to meet the interests

of the "Soviet" neo-bourgeoisie which was consolidating its position. And it, without wasting words, put an end to perestroika, taking advantage of the traitorous duplicity of its chief "architect". This was the outcome of the threatening of philistines with impending dictatorship which Yakovlev, Shevardnadze and other former party members did. The stage-managed "transition" to such "dictatorship" took place through skilfully deceived and betrayed members of the State Emergency Commission. It repeatedly took place to cover up the real socio-political coup which took place two weeks later when power was completely wrested from the hands of the working people.

Now it can be more definitely asserted that all the development of events in August and September this year was in the interests of domestic and foreign reactionaries in the disguise of pseudo democratic attirement. The plans for disruption of socialism in Russia, deprivation of its superpower might achieved at the expense of huge efforts and sacrifices of the working people were long and insistently being framed abroad. Through Gorbachev's perestroika international capital realized these hateful plans, slowed down the development of economic crisis in their country which the decrease of production and increase of unemployment in a number of countries heralded. Through Gorbachev's perestroika it was possible to disintegrate the Soviet Union, set its peoples at loggerheads, attribute the disasters specially organized by restorationists to Lenin and socialism, convert one-sixth of the globe into the source of cheap labour and raw materials for the "civilized" countries and into the world burial for the harmful wastes of their production. This dealt a heavy blow at the international working-class and communist movement and deprived it of its main pillar, world socialism which is now suffering most serious world-historic defeat.

This defeat became possible because as a result of accession of anti-communists to the leadership in the Soviet Union there was formed the bloc of socio-political forces which in the rays of Gorbachev's perestroika matured enough to come out in open offensive against socialism and its political institutions. As one of these forces it is necessary above all to name the national bourgeoisie of republics which seized the state power structures with the help of national communists. "War of sovereignties" and "war of laws" created necessary conditions for gradual disruption of the USSR. Separatism immediately received powerful support of the West. It is known, for example, that after the Second World War the Western allies confirmed the western frontiers of the USSR formed as a result of our victory, some of them, the legitimacy of entrance of Baltic countries into the Soviet Union. Now violating the understanding, they persistently egg nationalists on to withdrawal from the USSR.

At the time of August events the Russian neo-bourgeoisie which

played the decisive role in "suppressing putsch" openly, impudently and aggressively declared their egoistic anti-national interests for the first time. On August 19 the notorious International Commercial Bank appropriated millions of dollars for the future victims of "defence" of barricade which none stormed. In other words, they planned and paid for the future bloodshed. The *Moscow Chime* asserts that victims were not needed from the military viewpoint. But it was needed from the political viewpoint. Where is the limit to the cynicism of the "new masters of life"?

Analysis shows that the scenario of the events of August 19-21 was prepared abroad, direction belonged to Gorbachev and, maybe, with the participation of Yeltsin, members of the State Emergency Commission and "democrats" were characters and performers, and the result was the tragedy of three hundred million Soviet people. I suppose and hope that the truth can be revealed only through open legal proceedings amidst close attention of the mass media and public opinion. Moreover, rumour is afloat in Moscow that three of the members of the State Emergency Commission will not live till the trial.

With drums of pseudo exposure beating at the Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR counterrevolution could consolidate the political results of anti-constitutional coup, liquidate the CPSU, undermine defence capability of the multinationality great power in the state of disintegration and begin to do away with such pillar of the constitutional socio-political structure as the armed forces and law-protecting organs. Perestroika was buried with honour. The country was deprived of the union government and at the helm of state were put such "promising cadres" of Yavlinsky type, whose incompetence and state irresponsibility excited increased anxiety of millions of people.

Particular mention must be made of the CPSU. A little over three years ago Gorbachev declared: "We are heading for the new world—the world of communism. We will never turn off this path," and "Without the party equipped with the Marxist-Leninist theory there would not be socialism nor our great power." If socialism is buried and the great power is disintegrated, the party, too, ought to be liquidated. Viler betrayal can be hardly found in the history of all countries and peoples than that which the General Secretary committed against millions of the Soviet communists. This betrayal has its history.

Gorbachev's perestroika was born of Right opportunism which built its nest in the CPSU on the confines of the '60s. It gave beginning to the degeneration of the party. All the "pure" democrats came from the "sixtiesites" and "children of the 20th Congress". Their common cradle was the CPSU. Yeltsin paved the way for withdrawal from the CPSU and organized discredit of socialism, Lenin and all that to which he quite recently bowed and himself took advantage of to build a career of a prominent party bureaucrat. From July 20

this year was enforced Yeltsin's decree on the abolition of party leadership in enterprises, and institutions, which some leaders of party committees hastily began to carry out.

The CC of the CPSU refused socio-class assessment of this act of anti-communism and relegated the matter only to the "violation of legitimacy", which testifies to the inconsistency of the last composition of the Politburo and Secretariat of the CC of the CPSU actions of which all the more placed the party in the service of pro-fascist branch of the restoration of capitalism. In its declaration the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU called upon party members-Leninists to give decisive rebuff to the anti-communists-provocators and their accomplices in the leadership of the party.

When mayor of Moscow G. Popov closed down all the district committees and city committee in the capital contrary to the Constitution and laws, no party committees raised voice of protest nor addressed an appeal for strike or other constitutional forms of struggle. This "test balloon" of naked anti-communism enabled Gorbachev, without fearing complications, to spread Popov's decision all over the country. Everywhere began sealing of offices of party organs, "seizure" of money of the party and discontinuance of issue of party newspapers. Moral terrorism against communists was let loose. Passiveness of the masses of party members can be explained only by utter demoralization. None came forward to protect party committees, newspapers, publishing houses and museums of the party and party schools. Party organizations had to be disbanded. Most of them dissolved themselves. This could happen only in the party in the last stage of disintegration led by the entirely rotten upper echelon.

The Society "Unity" and supporters of the Bolshevik Platform did not waver in the conditions of rabid persecution of the supporters of socialism. On August 25, 1991 we came out with declaration in which we declared ourselves heirs and orthodox successors to the Leninist course of the CPSU. The Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU called upon party organizations, communists and non-party Bolsheviks to unite and prepare for the Constituent Congress of the party. At present everywhere are being founded the organizations of the Bolshevik Platform, which accept in their ranks the adherents ready to link their life and activity with the Lenin-type party.

In the conditions of disintegration and wavering the Organizational Committee of the Bolshevik Platform adopted resolution: "To expel Gorbachev Mikhail Sergeyevich, the former General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU, from the membership of the CPSU for the betrayal of the cause of Lenin and October Revolution, and the international working-class and communist movement and for the ruin of the socialist great power, the liquidation of the Leninist party, apostasy and double dealing, deception of the working people and demagogy." The Leningrad Organizational Bureau of the Bolshevik Platform adopted similar decision concerning B.V. Gidasnov. Although these decisions have no character of rules, in our opinion, they have great political significance since they reflect the present position of the broad sections of party members, conducing to the formation of appraisal of the activity of restorationists and renegades from the party-class viewpoint. This is confirmed by the hundreds of letters, telegrams and telephone calls we receive every day in which they unanimously support our appraisal and decisions.

It is necessary to approach this problem concretely without being carried away by emotions, pointing out the direct blame of the party bureaucrats for the present situation of the country, blood and tears of the Soviet people, for the disintegration and discredit of the CPSU. Actually the pro-Gorbachev's party bureaucrats slided down to the anti-socialist position, pointing out in the decision of the 28th Congress that there is no alternative to capitalist market in the country. Party bureaucrats are to be blamed for the fact that the publication of the materials of the supporters of the "Unity" and the Bolshevik Platform in the party press was banned. They distorted and falsified Marxism-Leninism, depriving it of its proletarian-class foundation.

In the vortex of history many from the party upper crust turned out to be worried only about their career and privileges and none of them showed himself to be the politician defending the genuine interests of the workers, kolkhozniks and working intellectuals. The pro-Gorbachev party ideologues converted *Pravda* into the toothless social-democratic newspaper, which entirely lost the traditions of the Leninist party. Now the chief editor Frolov recommends communists to pay party dues to his newspaper, apparently, as payment for absence of principle of *Pravda* and chameleonic policy. It is paradoxical, but the cessation of activity of pro-Gorbachev party "offices" liberated the initiative of communists-Leninists on whose conviction and self-sacrificing spirit the fate of the party and country depended.

At the same time, drawing these joyless conclusions, we must not go to the other extremes and moreover consider all party leadership as the "exploiter class" carrying out counterrevolutionary coup together with "shady elements", nationalists and speculators. Supporting Gorbachev, Yakovlev, Shevardnadze and other renegades, the party bureaucrats objectively conduced to the aggravation of social crisis and its solution in favour of homegrown bourgeoisie. But, the overwhelming majority of them subjectively did not expect such results, although they themselves propagandized and supported Gorbachev's perestroika. No small number of party workers resisted Gorbachev's regime though they failed finally to get out of the vicious circle of formal subordination by the rules to the recent ruling party. The supporters of the Bolshevik Platform must establish business relations with them, win them over to their side and use

their experience and possibility in restoring the Lenin-type party.

In other words, today we already cannot rely on the party apparatus and fight for conversion of the CPSU into the renovated party on the basis of the Bolshevik Platform as was planned at the Minsk conference. But we can and must critically use the party structures founded in the gravest crisis and approach the masses of communists through them who party bureaucrats-turncoats, renegades and liquidators recently persistently misled. Giving rebuff to the neo-official and now state anti-communism, the "Unity for Leninisim and Communist Ideals" must resolutely oppose the illegal nationalization of the property and money of the CPSU, persecution of unemployed party workers, call for discontinuance of "witch-hunt" and "prohibition of profession" and fight against judicial reprisals against the members of the State Emergency Commission who, if they violated Constitution, did by far less than Gorbachev, Yeltsin and "democrats" who committed real anti-constitutional coup in the country.

In conclusion it is necessary to point out that the supporters of the Bolshevik Platform are now obliged to act in the new socio-political conditions of victorious anti-constitutional coup. The Extraordinary Congress of the People's Deputies of the USSR finished off the remainder of the Soviet power with the establishment of the new authoritarian state structures. At the same time this congress practically buried itself and the Supreme Soviet, depriving the deputies of power in favour of "Presidents", "governors" and "mayors" who are called upon to form their cadres of "oligarches" and "dictators" in the interests of the revived business. Instead for the "chosen representatives of people" were left the deputy's pay and "privileges" till the expiry of their term which the former party bureaucrats might envy.

The influence of territory, regional, city, district Soviets converted into the powerless "talking-shops" is restricted everywhere depending on the appetites of the "new masters of life". The bourgeoisie which emerged victorious removed from the agenda of political life the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" under which it, deceiving the working people, headed for political coup. All the institutions of constitutional political system are being destroyed. On the agenda are again placed not only the defence of the rights of the working people but also the struggle for the power of the working class and its allies.

Apparently the economic difficulties will increase more in our country. The working people are persistently being inured to the thought of hungry and cold winter. Vegetable and potato harvest was a failure. Extraction of oil and coal decreased. Production dwindled everywhere. "Democrats" who occupied high posts proved their complete inability not only to manage the country but also to cope with ordinary problems of provision of livelihood of popula-

tion. Accusation of Stalin for the present disasters already can convince no one. Threatening with repression is also of little effect. It is fully possible that Gorbachev will become the next "scapegoat". Fascination for the "Western miracle" is waning. Moreover, the "civilized countries" surely will drift toward crisis and the number of beggars and the unemployed in 150 other countries which was considerable has doubled in recent two years.

In spite of the euphoria of victors–"democrats", I think, in prospect their coup will bring society to a deadlock the way out of which lies in the rout of counterrevolution. So far the Soviet people do not understand where the bourgeois sirens are leading them. Therefore the "new power" makes haste to give scope to private undertaking and business legislatively. Unacceptable to the working people is all the way of life of exploiter society with the greed for gains, individualism, sweating system, overall venality, power of money, wide gap between the poor and the rich. All this already causes spontaneous, unconscious resistance of the working people. This resistance pushes the restorationists of capitalism to tighten administrative-management measures and head for the Right authoritarian regime in politics. This is particularly distinctly manifested in Georgia, Moldavia and Lithuania.

In the RSFSR the affair with the "authoritarian" was brought into ridicule. Regent of the "heir to the Russian throne" promoted Yeltsin to "Great Duke". The former member of the Politburo and secretary of the regional committee of the CPSU who levelled "Ipatiev's house" to the ground took it as a matter of course without objections. You never know! Suddenly one day it may become useful. Gorbachev so far was not accorded such honour. Unluckily, all Russian tsars gathered the great power inch by inch "at the risk of their lives" but "tsar Boris", without waiting for extreme unction, already detached the Baltic provinces from the "integral and indivisible" territory and, moreover, together with Khasbulatov is striving to sell the Japanese the Kurile Islands drenched in Russian blood and sweat. How we can eventually live by begging with such "autocracy".

Aggravation of economic situation, rapid impoverishment of millions of working people, the first ranks of the unemployed, the youth deprived of future, chaos and muddle not only accelerate the realization of class interests but also bring the working people to unite in face of entrepreneurs and the new-rich. The "Soviet" neo-bourgeoisie carried away with the recent successes zealously adopts the political experience of the modern Western capital which opened for it special universities and schools of business. At the same time, the homegrown bourgeoisie gave rise to many political parties and political movements "from monarchism to anarchism" which immediately began to fight with each other. Today we are witnessing the aggravation of internal conflicts between different fractions of the

"new masters of life" and the intensification of struggle between them. The typical example here is the protracted strife between the capital mayor supported by the President of the RSFSR and the association of stockbrokers. The representatives of the movements and parties of the working people ought to learn to use the contradictions in the class enemy camp in their interests.

Apparently in store for us there is the extreme aggravation of irreconcilable contradictions in production, the economy, politics and culture as well as of class, inter-class, national and inter-nationality contradictions, which are objectively engendered by private property which separates and estranges people, social groups, classes, nations and nationalities and sets them against each other. Their aggravation may lead not only to the destruction of the productive forces, for example, breakdown of coke ovens, inundation of mines, disruption of railway transport, mass slaughter of cattle due to the lack of fodder, ruin of harvested crops, but also bring the country to overall civil war the seats of which are already on fire in a number of republics.

In the face of such development of events the "democratic" bourgeoisie already undertook to form the "national guards" that are designed to defend, arms in hand, its egoistic interests and serve as counterweight to the armed forces of the country which so far did not win the confidence of the "new masters of life". However, the experience of Yugoslavia and Georgia proves that it must not be ignored who will hold the new armed formations.

In the conditions of overall weakening of the Soviet state, independent of subjective wishes of both sides of hostilities, broadening of seats of civil war can develop into international conflict. No doubt, the cosmopolitanizing "democrats" who acceded to power will not hesitate to resort to the aid of the UN forces or individual "civilized" Western countries interested in the new division of the world. Such outcome, as is known, will be disastrous not only to the USSR and Europe but also to all mankind that will be thrown into the hell of the missile-nuclear world war.

Today it is necessary to speak about another serious danger which Gorbachev's perestroika brought us right up to. Speaking about this danger two years ago, the "Unity" had in view, so to speak, the theoretical possibility of transition to the fascist regime. Now it is already possible to speak about the real menace of fascism, which from possibility may, if not countered, directly convert into reality with all the inherent tragic consequences. It is known that nationalism which struck deep roots in society inevitably tends to develop into chauvinism, which, in its turn, presents the direct herald of fascistization of the power of capital. Another path is expansion of authoritarianism and cultism in the executive organs of power, which, "appropriating" legislative functions, weaken the functions and control of parliament. Today real for us are these two

paths to the fascist-type dictatorship, which are additionally nourished with the survivals of tsarist ideology in social consciousness.

Such turn of events excites alarm on the part of the overwhelming majority of our fellow countrymen of different social statuses, political orientations, religions and world outlooks, including the honest, to speak more correctly, misguided honest democrats who are now also opposed to the fascist menace although they do not always correctly appraise its social sources. In its declaration dated August 25 the Organizational Committee of the Bolshevik Platform called upon its supporters to begin to form the anti-fascist patriotic front everywhere jointly with all political parties, movements and public organizations which worry about the fate of the country.

The ideo-political foundation of the unified anti-fascist front can be the appeal for indestructibility of the great power, against further impoverishment of the working people, for the prevention of fascist dictatorship wherever its menace may come. Now it is impossible to unite the people who lost their faith in everything under the aegis of the CPSU which compromised itself through the betrayal of its upper crust. The Bolshevik Platform in the anti-fascist front should not call for the struggle for socialism but for opposition to the ferocious anti-communism, which directly paves way to destruction of all democracy including bourgeois one and leads to reaction and fascism. In our days all the sane citizens from monarchists and anarchists can be united under this slogan, I think.

The Bolshevik Platform and the "Unity" ought to solve another more difficult problem in the next two or three months. It is to prepare for the convocation of the Constituent Congress of the Lenin-type party the name of which the congress itself will decide on. In this connection on September 16 we prepared instructions, which are now sent to all committees and organizational bureaus. In them are indicated preparatory measures which ought to be taken without delay in provinces. The main thing among them is to form the primary and lower organizations of the Bolshevik Platform and admit into the party through them our active Bolsheviks-Leninists who so far have no party card. Precisely these organizations will be delegated to the Constituent Congress.

In our days it becomes more and more complicated not only to convene congress or conference but also to hold session of the political executive committee or organizational committee. It becomes more difficult materially and organizationally.

We have no one to count on. Unfortunately, not all comrades take into account the qualitative change of the situation in which we are to work. After the anti-constitutional coup which took place in the country we have around us the hostile political environment which expresses the interests of the new bourgeoisie and swindlers and demoralized population.

The "law-governed state" of Gorbachev-Yeltsin deprived us

even of personal safety. Practically we work in encirclement, deprived of rear and support of reliable allies and are obliged to depend on our strength and conviction. The hostile whirlwind of bourgeois counterrevolution strives to knock us down.

Now no one has the right to indolence and inaction, to endless empty argument and discussion, to fruitless experience and despondency, to clarification of personal relations and gossip. Independence, responsibility and initiative of each come to the fore. Organizers and men of action are needed as never before but not chatterboxes. The Bolshevik fraction and the "Unity" attract more and more attention everywhere. Thousands of people request us to help, explain, supply them with literature and admit into the society or the Bolshevik party. Their number is increasing, but some of our committees became so conspiratorial that their fellow countrymen establish contacts with them through the political executive committee. The question of newspapers matured in Ukraine and Byelorussia. It is desirable to issue them in mother tongue. In out-of-the-way places our publications which are very scarce are wrested from hand to hand. And the system of their dissemination leaves much to be desired.

Our committees ought to take active part in the general campaign for the defence of Lenin Mausoleum, the sacred graves at the Red Square. Whatever attitude we may assume to the betrayal of the party elite, we ought to raise firmly voices in defence of the CPSU. We may assume different attitude to each of the members of the State Emergency Commission but are duty bound, in my opinion, to launch public campaign to save them from judicial reprisals of counterrevolutionaries and renegades. This is our Bolshevik obligation. Fulfilling it, we will unite behind the "Unity" and the Bolshevik Platform the most advanced and progressive elements in our motherland perturbed with events.

It ought to be borne in mind that the struggle against restorationists was only started. The laws of history worked and will work in favour of socialism. Day always comes in the wake of night. We shall have our day!

Lithuanian International Movement,
No. 13 (29) for November 1991, pp. 1-3.

---

* Concerning this problem, N. A. Andreyeva somewhat later pointed out: "General Makashev rightly called the action of troops in Moscow 'demonstration of fighting equipment for children.' When on August 20 one TV reporter asked a soldier on the street whether he had cartridges, he received reply 'No'. Why did the protectors of the White House create 'militant' tension? In my opinion, genuine heroes, modest in Russian, sat in the armoured carriers and burned in them, obeying the order not to use weapons. I am convinced that the capricious goddess of history will not allow their names to sink into oblivion and the Soviet people sooner or later will know their names and give them their due....

"So far I have before my mind's eye a senior captain shown on the TV screen who told that he was offered a lot of money for defection to the 'White House', the sum he could hardly earn all his life even if he served until he became marshal. And in our times when officials lacked money he refused. In my opinion, in those conditions this was the highest valour of a soldier: incorruptible loyalty to one's oath .... Not all were such as the official-Tamanite mentioned above. The history of the last war shows that from the same village some went to partisans and some others went to serve in the German police."

Journal *Soviet Soldier*, 1992,
Nos. 3-4, p. 7

* * *

OH, MY RUSSIA, RUSSIA....

Fathers and children.... Since early times it is an old and always new theme. There was time when in our country it was entirely denied and then bashfully recognized and debated and, what is important, became more acute, overshadowing many other things, often more essential ones. Now there is a tendency to place the question of "fathers and children" in the epicentre of the bourgeois counterrevolution started in the country. Is it right? I think it is not. It is mistaken not to notice this problem at all, to deny the historical reality and absolutize it or, moreover, to make it a kind of master-key with the help of which it is supposedly possible to reveal and expose the cause of what is now taking place around us. In other words, this means to substitute artificially the global class contradictions of the era brought into the social space of the motherland with the collisions of age groups of population, "fathers and children", which are derived from them.

It is known that reactionaries always strove to recruit youth into their ranks. Not only because future belonged to the young people. In my opinion, mainly because the young generations are not encumbered with historical memory, credulous, not self-critical in their actions, socially romantic, easily excitable, and tend to convert rapidly their doubts into nihilism and aggressive denial of all. This enabled the "fathers from democracy" to carry away young people for some time under by no means progressive banners, impose upon them doubtful appraisal, slogans and symbols. Certainly in the tragic August days near the "White House" precisely thus were prepared volunteer hostages for "ritual sacrifice-offering" plotted beforehand somewhere who were not only regaled with cognac, wine and smoked sausage but also were supplied with tommy-guns, grenades and fire bottles.

Against whom were motley troops called out and "placed on alert" near the "White House", which, incidently, as is now known, none intended to attack? Who paid for this expensive militaristic ceremony? Definitely replying to the last question the *Komsomol Pravda* wrote: "Entrepreneurs carried money in suitcases into the

'White House'. 70 kilogrammes of money, hundreds of million rouble–this was not charity. This was investment. Lorries laden with sand, cranes, weapons, provisions– all this was bought by the money of the Russian entrepreneurs." As for the others who supposedly "attacked" the defenders of the "White House", they were by no means out-dated "fathers-conservatives" but those of the same age with the bellicose "democrats" in the capacity of soldiers of the Red Army, who patrolled on the streets of Moscow. They were in the armoured carrier and burned together with their "carrier" which was set on fire by fire bottles but obeyed the order not to use weapons.

Suppose they had used weapons, returning attack. In this case it is evident that the number of the "Heroes of the Soviet Union" in the capital would have increased many times and churches and synagogues would have been not enough to hold burial service. It seems to me that historians more than once have to trace the turmoil of "August 1991", and clarify what "fathers" hypocritically used what "children" to put an end to socialism, the Soviet power, the unity and integrity of the great power with thousand years long history at one stroke. The overwhelming majority of "children" in the country as well as "fathers", without heeding the appeals of the Russian President and Petersburg mayor for general strike and mass desertion, continued to work at their places of work, gathered in poor vegetable and potato crops and performed heavy military services in garrison. Thus young people were divided as all the society was done.

Noteworthy is the attitude of the "democratic upper crust" to the old generation of fellow countrymen who through their self-sacrificing labour brought the country to the advance line of socio-political and scientific-technical progress and saved mankind from Hitler's "new order" based on pan-Germanism, world domination, slavery and physical extermination of whole nations. This is an unprecedented betrayal of the generation which accumulated the historical memory of the motherland in them and objectively prevented young people from being fooled and converted into Mancurts or Ivans unaware of their class socialist relationship. The adherents of perestroika already reduced elderly people to poverty and, in the opinion of many veterans of war and labour, together with the recent reforms of the Russian President they gave beginning to genuine genocide, which already claimed the lives of hundreds of thousands of people on account of malnutrition, cold, moral terrorism and insult, lack of medicaments and crimes affecting the most defenceless.

My generation entered independent life in the beginning of the '60s. Now many write about the "sixtiesites", "children of thaw", who, as is asserted, led the socio-political protest against the CPSU, "bravely fought" against the "State Emergency Commission" and then became pioneers of perestroika. Such "rebels" were in the institute, too, where I studied. At first they behaved themselves as the

"leaders" of the Young Communist League, over-confidently pretending to the brilliant career. Then they undertook to work out pretentious projects and at last began to inform against one another, hoping to gain advantage for them. There started investigation, "strengthening" of the leadership of the institute, reshuffle of the chairs of social sciences, transfer of disaffected schemers to other institutes or departure for Israel. Although these events caused false rumours, they did not attract serious attention among students and teaching body. Now none already remembers these "sixtiesites" of the institute although some of them tried to use their "dissension" in the recent election campaign. These attempts failed.

As for the overwhelming majority of my generation ravaged by war from childhood, they, like all the postwar youth, studied sciences hard, disputed about novelties of literature, theatre and movie and dreamed about the happy future, simple human happiness, dug up potatoes in the fields of kolkhozy every year and built Narv Hydroelectric Station.... As far as I remember, none felt that he or she was the "slave of communism", understanding that without their selfless participation it would be more difficult for the country devastated by the unprecedented invasion. So far I cannot understand how Marina Salie, my senior, who headed the Food Commission in the Leningrad Soviet could declare "We are no slaves!" in reply to the request of farmers to help in the harvest of crops. As a result, at first vegetables and then a large proportion of the "second food" remained in the earth and the price of the imported potatoes several times exceeded the prices of orange, banana, pineapple and other exotic objects. Isn't it hence that in our country appeared sickly, pale and anemic children, schoolchildren fainting from hunger and hapless old people rummaging garbage bins?

The overwhelming majority of my classmates who dispersed all over the country remained such simple, modest, industrious people who were exacting to themselves, in which I more than once was convinced at the time of rare and chance encounters. The labour career and personal life of each formed differently. But, as far as I know, none became entrepreneur, businessman or demagogue slinging mud at the time of their youth. There are, of course, exceptions. They only confirm what I mentioned. Thus, for example, the husband of my class-mate, director of one of big institutes, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, taking advantage of his official position, "works" in several cooperatives and joint ventures, which briskly produce abroad products which were recently considered strategic materials. As the connoisseurs of the institute and masters of counting money in the pocket of their neighbours affirm, the present total income of the couple mentioned above exceeds 40,000 roubles per month. This does not prevent both of them from taking several hundred roubles for "concurrent office" in our impoverished institute of technology which soon will have

nothing to pay scholarships to students and salary to teachers and scientific workers.

Serious shift is taking place in the consciousness of youth. In the body of students the last illusion on the entry into the "civilized paradise" and the restoration of capitalist relations is gradually vanishing. With each passing day students more and more clearly begin to understand that the overwhelming majority of them are not to become millionaires. Moreover, the present students gradually lose the former confidence in the future, which the state appointment after graduation from university which was abused by the "democrats" assured them earlier. Hence a look of gloomy thoughts on the faces of students in auditorium. Three million students already know that a large proportion of them will not get the place of work of their speciality after graduation from university and college but replenish the army of the unemployed. This is not only crush of hope but also life tragedy for young men, for which the "fathers-reformists" ought to be called to account.

The current authorities ought to bear direct responsibility for the fact that the hostels of students and female workers, according to newspapers, somewhere are converted into a kind of gay quarters, that narcomania, venereal disease, homosexuality, lesbianism affected part of our youth and that flood of foreign mass culture corrupts the tastes, mentality and morals of girls and boys and makes them aggressive, brusque and dissolute.

People made wise by life experience are depressed by the forced smiles of the young persons posing stark-naked before cinecamera or TV camera, demonstration of imitation of particularly intimate relations not to be publicly discussed or brought before public view, advertisement of "photo models" and Russian "brides" for export, naive discussion of young people on the TV screen as to the desirability of entry of our country into the United States of America.

Some of wise men said, "If youth are degenerated, the nation will be destroyed." Judging from the argument of A.N. Yakovlev and other "fathers-adherents of perestroika" the internal and international reaction counted on this. But such course of events does not suit the working people. The anti-national and anti-patriotic policy more and more meet with a repulse everywhere and on the part of youth. The Young Communist League went to pieces not because of the "exhaustion of communist ideas" but, above all, because its degenerated upper crust, urged by the Gorbachev's party bureaucrats, forced upon it "market relations", greed for gains and cult of money entirely incompatible with the basic social aspiration of the working people. Young students and the young people now take up the struggle for their class interests.

Last year influx of young workers and students into our All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" and the patriotic organizations increased. More and more young people are

taking part in the anti-fascist resistance in Baltic states. Other organizations of social protection and national self-preservation in our society join it. This allows us to look forward to the future with optimism.

In conclusion of my reflection on the theme "Fathers and Children" I quote a passage of new poem of Mikhail Dudin, Leningradite poet, hero-front-line soldier:

Oh, my Russia, Russia
Song of life and delight to the eye
How many times death came upon you
But it cannot bring you down this time.
Aren't we strong with strength
Or weak of talent?
Our girls hurry in vain
To foreign countries.

In spite of titanic efforts of the faulty "fathers" of perestroika the Soviet youth did not become the motive force of counterrevolution. Today their historical mission is to maintain the integrity of the great power, restore, clear, renovate and strengthen the power of the working people and socialism.

Journal *Capital*,
No. 1 for 1992, pp. 10-12

* * *

On November 8,1991 in Leningrad was held the Constituent Congress of the ABCP. 234 delegates including 178 persons with the right to vote took part in its work.

At the congress were represented RSFSR, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldavia, Kazakhstan and also the republics of Transcaucasia, Middle Asia and Baltic states. In the delegation of the RSFSR were included the representatives of 19 autonomous republics, territories and regions.

The congress heard the report of N. A. Andreyeva, Chairman of the Organizational Committee of the Bolshevik Platform *The Current Moment and Our Tasks*, and report on the draft programme and rules of the party.

With adoption of resolution the congress founded the ABCP.

At the congress were also adopted the programme and rules of the party, appeal "To the Soviet and world's public opinion, representative power and judicial organs of the country at all levels" and declaration "On violation of rights and freedoms of the Soviet citizens".

Nina Alexandrovna Andreyeva was elected General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party.

THE CURRENT MOMENT AND OUR TASKS

(Report to the Constituent Congress of the All-Union Bolshevik Communist Party, November 8, 1991)

Dear Comrades, October 1917, the sidereal hour of peoples of Russia, proclaimed the beginning of a new stage in the history of mankind, the beginning of the era of radical solution of the world's antagonism between labour and capital, the era of victory of reason over power. It is not the fault of the Russian working class and its leader Lenin that the working people had to go to the kingdom of reason, employing violence and breaking the resistance of landlords, bankers, mill-owners, popes and merchantry. The old world of oppression did not surrender, nor made a compromise and therefore the proletarian revolution had no other alternative but the suppression and annihilation of the class enemy, launching life-and-death struggle.

The October Revolution the 74th anniversary of which we today commemorate not only saved the integrity and statehood of Russia in the First World War which was a failure for tsarism but also laid socio-political and then technical-economic foundations of salvation of mankind from the fascist genocide in the Second World War.

The present timeservers-anti-communists, the successors to the classes overthrown by revolution who underhand acceded to power hurry to do away with our glorious historic revolutionary past, root out of the consciousness of the masses of people all that is connected with October, Lenin and socialism, inwardly shuddering for what they committed in anticipation of the inevitable historical retribution. Our patriotic and international obligation is to lift the flag of Lenin thrown down by opportunists and traitors, unite communists and the working people under it and lay the foundation of rebirth of the renovated socialist motherland.

1. Gorbachev's Perestroika, Its Summing-up and Consequences

It is needless to anyone to prove that Gorbachev's perestroika led to overall cirsis. Anyone meets with this everyday. The President officially admitted that the problem of survival already arose. Incidently he did not bat an eyelid as if he told of the regular talks with Bush. Foreign analysts predict death toll of one and a half million of our fellow countrymen on account of hunger, cold, lack of medicaments, inter-nationality skirmishes and the spread of crimes. But no one from the "merciful humanists" is indignant, although they were in the August days in connection with the death of the three "Heroes of the Soviet Union" in the capital.

Yeltsin and "democrats" attribute the cause of the on-coming catastrophe to the slow enforcement of restorationist reforms and Gorbachev and Yakovlev are talking about some errors of anonymous performers of perestroika. Actually the cause, on the one hand, lies in the destruction of the economic, political and ideological foundations of socialism and, on the other hand, in the spontaneous resistance of the working people to the attempts to drive forcibly them into the capitalist "paradise". Incidently this destruction is carried out under the slogan of human rights and freedoms, but in essence, only of the persons to whom counterrevolution gave the possibility to exploit and oppress others.

Destruction of the constitutional structure in the USSR bore and bears purposive, organized and coordinated character and is all carried out scrupulously and in a planned and consistent manner. Let me name some stages on this path of adventurism and social and national treachery.

As is known, it started with the "anti-alcoholic campaign", which rapidly imparted unprecedented scale to the primary accumulation of capital by criminal structures and their confident financial-economic "growth". The "law on socialist enterprises" created situation "without plan and without market", gave beginning to the uncontrollable growth of income, vanishment of cheap commodities needful to people from production, and undermined consumers' socialist market. The "law on cooperatives" legalized conversion of the conditional non-actual money into the "live" actual money, which undermined the financial system, gave green light to the outflow of national property abroad and accelerated growth of the criminal strata of entrepreneurs, businessmen and speculators. The "law on lease" caused exhaustion of raw material and production bases, growth of corruption, and often ruin of enterprises about which the mass media prefer to keep its tongue.

The "declaration of the sovereignty of republics" laid legal foundation for the disruption of the USSR, destruction of the unified national-economy complex, readdressed the main streams of minerals and raw materials to foreign markets, opened door to the robbery of all-people property, led to instilling in the consciousness of the masses of people rejection of understanding of the common fate of peoples inhabiting our country, to emergence of hundreds of thousands of refugees driven out of their native places by the turmoil of perestroika and to the "war of laws" and let the separatist bourgeois-nationalist forces run riot.

The change of the basic clauses of the Constitution of the USSR effected without the All-Union referendum was aimed to remove the CPSU from the controlling and integrating functions, eliminate clauses about the all-people character of the state property from the basic law of the Soviet State and to introduce non-socialist multi-party system, which led to the transfer of power to the anti-socialist

and anti-communist forces.

The "laws on denationalization and conversion into private property" furnished a legal basis for the sale of national property amassed by the labour of generations, for liquidation of basic social rights of the working people, for rapacious exploitation of majority of the Soviet people by the criminal minority. In other words, they brought about the basic change of the socio-economic structure confirmed legally by the Constitution.

The "foreign investment law" laid the legal foundation for the intensive exploitation by foreign capital of the raw material and energetic resources of the motherland, plunder of cheap labour of the Soviet people, acquisition by the West of control over the economy, culture, and then politics of our motherland. The "consession law" extended these possibilities. Sponsors of restoration of capitalism dictate our country socio-political conditions, making us force transition to market, conversion into private property, "liberalization" of prices and restraint of rise in wages and the like. The upward spiral of foreign debt flings the country into the noose, converting not only the present generation but also the future generations into debtors. The independence and sovereignty of the yesterday's superpower and its defence capability are placed under control. The fate of "banana republic"–this is what the transnational monopolies settled for us in collusion with homegrown capitalizers.

The "Presidency law" opened the way for the restriction of power of the Soviets, transfer of legislative functions to the executive power in the person of Presidents, governors, prefects and mayors. The increasing hypertrophy of "democratic" executive power consolidated by bourgeois nationalism means real possibility of sliding down to authoritarianism, reaction and pro-fascist regime. Particularly this is clearly observed in Baltic states, Georgia and a number of other republics. The Fifth Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR proposed desovietization of political system, having created the State Council and a number of other authoritarian structures. At the same time the congress castrated itself and the Supreme Soviet, depreciating the legislative activity and control of parliament. Instead of the "chosen representatives of the people" solid deputy's salary was mercifully left as compensation for their political inability. Now the process of desovietization is going on wide and deep.

Destruction of state defence structures under the signboard of the so-called "military reform" and "reorganization" started with castration of the party, depoliticization and deideologization of these important institutions which by their nature cannot be without ideology and politics. The main aim of these reforms are to separate the military and Cheka collectives from the working people, and break their class and worker-peasant backbone, and subordinate them to the dirty plays of anti-national political forces. Their role as the

main pillars of defence of the constitutional socio-political structure was undermined.

The "yellow" press cries, "The army cannot stand guard over the new order to be created. It is doomed to be victim to reforms." The professional cadres most faithful to the constitutional structure are driven out of the armed forces and law-protection organs and are replaced with hirelings and adventurists. People who are aimed not at the strengthening of but at the destruction of the defence shield are placed at key posts. First steps were taken for conversion of Gorbachev-Bakatin's "state security service" into some social semblance of the tsarist Okhranka (public peace section) or Hitler's Gestapo.

Such is the outline of the basic chronological stages of destruction and liquidation of national economic and moral-political potential of socialism. Plans of domestic counterrevolution here are inseparably tied up with the geopolitical interests of the enemy of our motherland, or, to speak more accurately, world imperialism, the same imperialism which does not think of leaving the international political arena in spite of the idle talks of our "democratic" windbags but is lengthening its span of life by disruption of socialism. Plans of liquidation of the first worker-peasant state in the world after 1917 were not taken away even a day from the work tables of heads of government, military and intelligence headquarters of the "civilized countries". Today they are successfully being effected before our eyes.

Restorationists promise the Soviet people to replace the so-called "barrack socialism" with "consumption society" of the West European type in the end of the "transition period". The price of the "replacement", as is mentioned above, is millions of ruined people and hundreds of millions of impoverished people. How many years does it take us to go to this "paradise"? According to American experts, if the yearly rise in per-capita income is steadily maintained at the level of 5 per cent, our living standard will reach half (?!) the present West European one in 20 years.... Of course, on condition that we join in the colonial exploitation of the "third world" and, at the same time, force the plunder of our future generations through the total sale of irretrievable natural resources, land and territories.

But, if we do not so, after the present destruction of national economic complex such tempo of growth cannot be expected. Hence, it will take more than 50-60 years of "transition". Of course, most of us will not live till the advent of such "happiness". Therefore, the number of Jews, Germans and other, so to speak, "pinched" and "oppressed" people who want to emigrate from the USSR increases.

What is the "new social force" which broke through to political power and now forcibly try to achieve economic domination? What is its "group" politico-social portrait? Today the "Soviet" neo-bourgeoisie which was revived and nursed by Gorbachev's perestroika

whose policies became evident to his sponsors and former admirers, is losing "points". The foreign investors who frequented the country possibly realized that at the new stage they could not get anywhere with the "architects" of the perestroika which perished quietly and had to "change horse in crossing".

Who will replace these hapless Presidents? Possibly Sobchak, loquacious sophist-pragmatist with malicious unseeing eyes and the gait of ordinary provincial barrister? In this case his "presentation" by Lady Thatcher whom the mayor flatteringly made up to when she visited "Saint-Petersburg" on the occasion of fair of businessmen from the "East-European express", can be deemed successful. In 1984 precisely Maggy gave her blessing to Mikhail Gorbachev in the leadership of the CPSU and was not mistaken in the choice.

Simultaneously with the Petersburg's mayor preparations are possibly being made for the assent to Olympus of Khasbulatov, former teacher-Marxist "biting" surreptitiously his President and publishing his "reminiscence of accession to power" on his own in the wake of the couples of Gorbachevs and Sobchaks. There remains question: With whom will the new power fill the "Matroskaya Tishina" (seaman's calm) and other similar establishments deficiency in which Russia never felt, in the wake of members of the State Emergency Commission who were "guilty without guilt"?

Under all of us now seethes a volcano of irreconcilable social antagonisms which is ready to reduce the long-suffering motherland to ashes.

II. The Working People's Front against Perestroika

Degradation of personality, irreconcilability, distrust, fear and despondency of the broad sections of population became ominous reality of our days. As a result of rabid anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda many people lost ideological foundation and political landmark of socially significant activity and became a light prey of restorationists and capitulationists. Only a few so far begin to miss the loss of recent well-being, stability and personal security.

Finely taking advantage of the backward mood of the deceived, the politicians and ideologues of neo-bourgeoisie who broke through to power take the inertia and apparent simple-heartedness of the working people for their inability to recognize their interests and lack of will to take decisive action for self-defence. This "social prostration" is skilfully nursed by mass media. Having converted the Soviet Union into the arena of political bargaining of bourgeois-nationalist and Mafia clans, the leading conductors of counterrevolution above all fear "power confrontation" with the working people, which, in their words, presents "fatal danger to the unexperienced class" of the Soviet new-rich.

At the same time, the frightened Gorbachev's party bureaucrats warn that "disillusionment will come after a large proportion of population of the country personally experience the sufferings caused by the destruction of social, production, state and cultural structures". In order to save the Soviet bourgeois the authors of one of draft programmes of the CPSU proposed that the "work experience accumulated in the CPSU in the condition of crisis be gathered, kept and used" and that the party "infrastructure", that is, the organs of party leadership be used. However, Yeltsin and then Gorbachev, too, turned down such tempting proposal, suspending, in essence, banning the activity of the CPSU.

Restorationists see the main social danger to their policy in the working class, which accounts for 62 per cent of population of the country. The strikes in miners' regions last year nearly wrecked Gorbachev's perestroika. Now every effort is exerted to split workers, set them against one another, accuse them of difficulties and crisis and implant virus of nationalism in their midst and, if possible, buy their leaders like the former chairman of the United Front of the Working People Yarin, who was included in the Presidential Council, installed in the splendid flat in the capital and made active executioner of the restorationist policy. Split in the trade-union movement is encouraged, collectives of big enterprises and munition complexes go to pieces and transfer of highly qualified workers to cooperatives is stimulated. "Hegemons" and "work animals" are maltreated in every way.

The ideologues of restoration assert, vying with each other, that the contemporary working class lost their progressive role and has no historical prospect any more, as if in place of them came "tadpoles", "white-collar workers" who became the basis of society in their post-industrial hypostasis. Such assertion is aimed to disarm the working people politically, dissociate them into separate ranks, and prevent formation of the unified anti-imperialist front on an international scale and overthrow of the power of national bourgeoisie in individual countries. It is intended to make a restorationist breach in the socialist countries and "softly" transfer them to the track of capitalist market economy and private property.

Actually the significance of the working class did not fall in the contemporary world but rose on the contrary. With all structural changes brought about by the scientific-technical revolution the working class grows qualitatively and quantitatively. In the West the so-called "middle class" rather goes over to the sphere of service than it is "washed away". Today rural toilers, working intellectuals and other sections of population employed in social production and existing by their own production labour stand close by the working class in relation to property and other class characteristics. This strengthens the social basis of the working class and increases its possibility to unite different strata of population, making them its allies.

Precisely this now puts the class enemies on their guard who in prospect cannot expect the support of the deceived masses of people and are obliged to rely on the hired watchdogs and, mainly on venal writers and mouthpieces who not only mislead people but also can leave the whole sections of the working people in the social impasse of restoration for some time. Hence the false myth about the "common valuables of mankind" which are supposedly more human and wider than common proletarian ones. But it is quite evident that especially the interests of exploiters and the elite sections serving them are passed off as the common valuables of mankind.

The main tragedy of the working people of the USSR now lies in that the working class lost the leading role in society and their political organization. In recent three-four decades the CPSU slided down to Right opportunism, taking a number of brotherly communist parties with it. In the years of perestroika the position of opportunists changed into social-democratism, Menshevism and bourgeois restorationism. The CPSU as the party of the working class is liquidated and then generally is removed from the political arena. But fault for this rests with the opportunist leadership of the Central Committee of the CPSU in the '60s-'90s, but not with the millions of communists who first fell victims to unprecedented treachery. Most of them honestly and self-sacrificingly worked, strengthened and defended socialism and allowed no one to throw shadow over them, denouncing them as opportunists or capitulationists. Even now communists-Leninists lead the anti-restoration front of the working people, drawing most staunch defenders of socialist system into their ranks.

In our days of hard trials the three basic socio-political directions emerged and were formed on the basis of the ruined CPSU. One of them is the anti-communist one (former "group of democratic platform"), another is social-democratic one (former centrist group) and the third is communist, Leninist one. Struggle between them, it seems to me, eventually ought to decide the fate of the country.

After the August events the "group of democratic platform" was reorganized into the People's Democratic Party of Russia. We may suppose that in the wake of Vice-President of Russia Rutskoy, Yakovlev, Shevardnadze and other "democratic" restorationists will realize their possibilities in the same spirit. These parties of the "middle class of entrepreneurs" are designed for the support of the "unpopular reforms" of Yeltsin and all the present restorationist adventurism. Decisively disassociating them from the policy and ideology of the CPSU, they at the same time hypocritically declare that they are the "unique legal legitimate heir to the property of the CPSU". They are likely to receive it from grateful Presidents.

The "anti-communists from the CPSU" now joined a number of many parties and movements of openly bourgeois character. Some members of the "Democratic Party of Russia" and "pure democrats"

fell distrustful of the former party members. They already are tired of their lack of forgiveness. Zealots of purity of their "democratic" ranks proceed with reason from it that those who once betrayed can betray many times, following "pluralism".

Two years ago a veteran of war told me in his letter about a case which comes back to me when I think of the essence of the present activity of Yakovlev, Shevardnadze, Yeltsin, Rutskoy and other former party members. In the victorious 1944, during a lull in battle at night one soldier of middle Asian nationality deserted from battle outposts to Germans. What made the semiliterate soldier speaking Russian badly flee was conflict with a sergent. In the morning commotion and shooting took place at the positions. A man with a sheet of veneer at the chest ran from the German trench, driven by the burst of machine-gun fire. The Germans wrote on the plate: "Not tongue for us, not fighter for you". He with the plate on his chest collapsed into our trench. Military tribunal decided all within the set time without bureaucratism. The deserter replenished the number of "victims of Stalin's repression". If the hapless soldier now can arouse some pity, the present defectors from the CPSU only deserve contempt.

The orthodox Gorbachev's party bureaucrats who handed all property and finances of the CPSU over to anti-communists without words, now not only quietly denounce the General Secretary expecting new Presidential nomination for them but also set to found parties, drawing into them activists favorite with the present philistine. Thus, recently under the private patronage of the member of the Central Committee of the CPSU and his colleagues there was founded the Socialist Party of the Working People headed by deputies, cosmonauts, former party workers and "dissident Marxists". Reporter, A.A. Denisov, professor-social scientist and former communist called on the new-emerging socialists to give up "Utopian Marxist and Bolshevik doctrines and become party of sound meaning". Packing his diehard opportunism in professorial slyness, the people's deputy called for "peaceful development of socialism into capitalism", advocated "domination of private undertaking in the sphere of service" and called for cooperation with all except Bolsheviks from the "Unity" (!!).

Similar parties of "petty entrepreneurs" are organized in republics, too, where they have their national coloring. Their ideo-political basis is the lees of many varieties of draft programme of the party worked out already by the pro-Gorbachev Central Committee of the CPSU. The aim of founding these social-democratic, petty-bourgeois organizations is to neutralize party masses and prevent their consolidation on the position of the working class. If the "party of Rutskoy" was founded "under Yeltsin", the "party of Roy Medvedev-Denisov" under Gorbachev himself, who, having betrayed and dissociated himself from the CPSU, lost direct support of the party. The party bureaucrats, displaying activeness in drawing

communists in this party, certainly expect to recover lost influence with its help. However, social democratic parties of Left as well as Right "centre" have no future, I think. They inherit from the CPSU infected with opportunism all its illness and weakness which will ruin it someday.

After the group of the Marxist platform entered the Socialist Party with the Right fraction, communists in the present political spectrum are represented by the Communist Initiative and the Bolshevik Platform. Here arises natural question: Why are the positions of communists represented by two trends which are formed in separate parties? Why cannot they come to an agreement as to uniting forces? Hundreds of comrades ask this rightly, which requires definite answer.

Above all, we from the beginning stood and stand for such unification and practically are realizing unity of action. Moreover, such socio-political movements as the United Front of the Working People and "Unity" which became later the basis of the Communist Initiative and the Bolshevik Platform emerged as one organization in the beginning of 1989. But at the last moment the coordinators of the United Front of the Working People dissociated themselves from us on the suggestion of Smolny and declared that they would act separately from us. And they so far refuse to take part in our conferences to which they are always invited personally. At the same time they constantly make it difficult for the activists from "Unity" to take part in their measures, which provides blessed food for the "yellow" press.

Of course, between us there are certain differences, so to speak, in the political status and in the approach to programme. If, for example, we were not allowed into the party press on the official instructions of the "tops" of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the "supporters of Initiative" appeared in its pages, though not often. Moreover, money was given out of the treasury of the CPSU for their newspapers, which surprisingly are fast provided with all that are necessary. Our newspapers are issued entirely on the dues of members and means of our supporters, experiencing often incredible difficulty with paper, printing house and the like. If conferences and congresses of the United Front of the Working People and the "Initiative" were held in big halls belonging to the CPSU, "Unity" rented the building of no such value, paying for it at the commercial price.

The forums of the "supporters of Initiative" were attended by fairly prominent party bureaucrats. But only separate party staff members were sent to our meetings in the capacity of "observers" and "controllers". The leaders and propagandists of the Communist Initiative toured all over the country on the mission of party organs, which we could hardly dream of. And in their official speeches Gorbachev and his company called "Unity" and the Bolshevik Platform

their first and main enemies, which naturally caused fully definite reaction in the created system.

We do not intend to ascertain who are more Marxist ideologically as is said. Marxism-Leninism, as is known, is not collection of ready decisions adduced in quotation, but method and guide to action. At the same time many recognize that the ideological position of the Bolshevik Platform is more consistent, definite and radical. The "supporters of the Initiative", as a rule, belatedly make the same appraisal and conclusions as we did, for the situation in the country itself "works" for our positions growing closer.

Our main theoretical difference is the view on the socialist past of the country. We, for example, cannot agree that the USSR Constitution of 1936 "legally rescinded the Soviet power" and gave beginning to the "introduction of parliamentary system", as the theoreticians of the "Initiative" assert. Arguing against such appraisal in our Orlov newspaper *Unity*, V. Kobel rightly called it not only entirely wrong but also practically dangerous, for it covers up the genuine causes of the crisis of the political system to the delight of party bureaucrats and destroyers of socialism.* It is characteristic that V. Kobel came to the Bolshevik Platform from the "Initiative" and remains zealous supporters of cooperation with it.

As mentioned above, perestroika legalized Right opportunism in the CPSU and put party policy under the secret control of entrepreneurs and businessmen. Of course, in the leadership of the party then there were "faithful Leninists" or "orthodoxes" like Ligachev, Polozkov, Zyuganov, Shenin and other party bureaucrats. The opportunist upper crust of Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze adapted itself to the interests of domestic and foreign capital, and the party bureaucrats and "faithful Leninists" adapted themselves to the opportunists in the interests of maintenance of "peace and unity in the party". As a result, opportunism held sway in the leadership of the party and link between the policy of world capital and that of party bureaucrats and "Leninists" was formed. And millions of the Soviet communists were betrayed and sold and the country was brought at the threshold of reaction and fascism.

It seems to me that the now prevailing situation is somewhat similar to the situation in Germany in the beginning of the '30s. In the dramatic battle between communists-supporters of Thalmann and Hitler's national socialism the German social democrats boasted of their "centrist" position though they declared through the lips of Kautsky that communism is worse than fascism. In this way they misled, split and disarmed the working class and other working people. Then the Comintern and J.V. Stalin rightly characterized this treachery as "social fascism", I think. It was right notwithstanding that after Hitler's accession to power social democrats as well as communists were thrown into prison and concentration camp. I hope that our "democratic" intellectuals who are inclined to accuse com-

munists of all remember this tragic lesson of history.

In this connection I was bewildered by the recent declaration of V. Tyulkin, one of the leaders of the "Initiative" who welcomed the foundation of the Socialist Party of Roy Medvedev-Denisov and expressed hope that "in future it will become good ally of communists". The current influence of Gorbachev's party bureaucrats was probably reflected in this declaration. But compromise with opportunism yet never did good to any one, with whatever tactical considerations the deviation from the strategic line of Leninism may be covered up. I do not want that this time compromise formed a link among opportunism, neo-bourgeoisie and the Soviet communists. The leaders of the "Initiative" obviously overrated their polemic possibilities, hoping to persuade socialists at their congress. Today the question is not the different views and formulations but the basic difference between the proletarian and petty-bourgeois positions.

Some comrades raise a question: Why do not we hold congress jointly with the "supporters of the Initiative" in Sverdlovsk? Because none invited us there and we learned about it from the newspapers. After this we fixed the date of venue of our congress. A number of our comrades from provinces were nominated to the congress of the "Initiative" in Sverdlovsk. I think it useful to form a delegation with some of them which would express our brotherly solidarity to the Communist Initiative and readiness for cooperation on behalf of our congress.

Finally, when the question of unification of the Bolshevik Platform with the Communist Initiative is raised, with whom to unite, as a rule, is not made precise. It is known that the "Initiative" is split into two-three trends and has programmes of different authorship and so far does not know what to do. Our joining can only increase their muddle and cause fresh difficulties. Today Lenin's behest is perhaps of vital significance as never before: "Before being united, it is necessary to dissociate oneself decisively, identifying who is who to the end." It seems to me that the fact of existence of an independent party of Bolshevik-Lenin type in the political spectrum of the country will exert positive influence on the wavering communists and radicalize the other parties which emerged in place of the disrupted CPSU. Only the historical practice will settle the problem of political rightness.

III. The Name and the Theoretical Foundation of the Party

Let me touch on the name of the party to be founded. Concerning this problem, we received hundreds of letters in which different names were proposed and different arguments were adduced for their grounds. It seems to me that in settling the problem of its name we should proceed from two considerations. Above all, we should

not be swayed by the philistine mood and adapt the name of the party to it. If we do so, we will be obliged to call it something like the party for protection of animals. On the other hand, pursuing the principled strategic line of Bolshevism, tactically we ought to take into account the present level of social consciousness, myths imposed on the working people and the necessity of legal functioning of the party in the framework of the Constitution and so on.

Such flimsy reasoning is unacceptable for us as "Lenin founded the Bolshevik party not for registration but for the overthrow of tsarism". The party to be revived ought to use all the so far existing legal possibilities for its normal functioning. If these possibilities will disappear, let us speak about others. So far registration in Ministry of Justice will give us possibility to have our own party newspaper and bank account and claim our right to the property of the CPSU and so on.

Now let me try to classify the proposals I received from comrades. The first question is whether we found a party or a union. As is known, party means part. It means part of class or social group expressing and defending its interests more or less consistently. Word "union" presupposes the existence of relatively independent political subjects which can conclude or dissolve this union and be in different relation with this union and with each another. I suppose that historically unification of the like-minded but not of "allies" corresponds to Bolshevism, that is, party is needed but no union.

We called the party All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks-Leninists), ACP (B-L) in abbreviated form, in the draft documents prepared for the congress. Some comrades propose that the party be called the All-Union Bolshevik Communist Party (ABCP), that is, as it was called till the 19th Party Congress. Others consider that in the choice of name of party it is necessary to go ahead but not to return to the old appellation. Ukrainian comrades object to the term "All-Union", taking into account the present mood in their republic. There is objection to the inclusion of indication of Bolshevism in the appellation of party, because it is now difficult to explain people the meaning of Bolshevism, for it is already history. Only indication of the communist character of the party will not arouse objection of any one.

The number of comrades who consider that the appellation ought to reflect its proletarian worker's character increases. In this case it can be called Leninist Communist Workers' Party (LCWP) or Communist Workers' Party of Bolsheviks (CWPB). At the same time I point out that workers' party is the party which maintains the ideo-political position of the working class, the most progressive class which historically accumulates the basic interests of all sections of the working people, but not the party consisting of exclusively workers and only for workers.

Recently in the CPSU and petty bourgeois parties the illusion

spread that the main thing is to think out appelation, slogans, terms and invent accurate formulations, platforms and programmes. But it is by no means so. The question is how to implement all that are worked out at congresses and conferences and how to bring the adopted resolutions home to the broad sections of the working people, convincing them in their correctness. Accepting basic documents and resolutions, we ought not to bother about details however they may seem significant. We also ought not to reduce all discussion to the appellation of party. Otherwise, we run the risk of being converted, figuratively speaking, into an immobile tugboat whose all steam was wasted in whistle. In the practice of concrete work in the provinces we are more than once likely to return to the problems discussed today and possibly give up something. Such is life, which does not mark time.

The disruption of the Soviet Union requires us to approach otherwise the structure of the party to be founded. The structure of the CPSU reproduced the nationality-territorial structure and was the carrying structure of all political system of the country. Today there is no such system. Therefore, we should act in all "social space" of the country as the party having exclusively class character. In other words, in all the "sovereign states" the party to be founded ought to emerge as the unique multinationality-international political force which has no intermediary structure in the form of republican organizations or parties.

Refrainment from federal structure will help avoid nationalist influence which ruined the CPSU. Only in this case communists-Leninists will feel everywhere the support of unique international force behind them. We ought to arrange cooperation and mutual assistance with organizations and parties of socialist orientation.

One of the important tasks of the party to be founded is to take part in the formation of the unified patriotic front which helps unite all to whom the fate of the motherland is dear. Among them can be not only the working people but also most reasonable cooperators, entrepreneurs, businessmen who come to understand what abyss Gorbachev, Yeltsin and their company are bringing the country and them as its citizens to.

Does founding party on the Bolshevik platform mean that "Unity" will become such party? No it does not. All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" is the mass socio-political movement which unites the broad sections of people with fairly different views but inspired with the unique aim of the defence of socialism and Leninism. The rules were adopted in the society but not all organizations, softly speaking, abided by their requirements. For example, the Moscow organization of the "Unity" did not pay even one rouble to the treasury of the society during all the period of its activity, although the member's fee was fixed higher in Moscow than in the "Unity" as a whole.

Further, the rules of the "Unity" presupposed only individual participation of the members of the society in the work of political organizations similar to ours. However, there were cases of a number of our organizations joining the United Front of the Working People, which the "democrats" advertized with delight and which led to split and internal frictions. The Political Executive Committee did not draw special attention to this, understanding that sooner or later comrades themselves would come to recognize in practice the inconvenience of sitting "on two chairs". Naturally, the party of the like-minded cannot tolerate such practices and will make more rigid demand on their members. Particularly this concerns the members of the leading organs.

In the draft rules of the party it proposed to refrain from national, regional, age and other representation, reduce the number of members and candidates of the central committee as far as possible, carefully choose comrades for it, but it happened not so always in "Unity" in which one-fourth of the members of the Political Executive Committee does not take active part in the work.

Of course, we are interested in that more young people and workers take part in the leadership of the party to be founded. But at the present stage when the party is formed and can be deprived of legality, in the first place, it is necessary to select politically matured, self-sacrificing comrades with initiative whose conditions of life and work allow them to be in different regions of the country and conduct propaganda and organizational work. The same is the case with the party organizers of the central committee.

The "Unity" became an original cradle of the party of Bolsheviks-Leninists to be revived. There hundreds and thousands of comrades accumulated political experience and checked their possibilities. Natural selection of those capable of working on the communist principles and personally taking the heavy burden of responsibility upon themselves seemed to have taken place. Of course, now not all in the "Unity" are ready to observe the rigid party discipline. And that in the current conditions when membership of the party to be founded may become the cause of office and family troubles and involve certain trials and risks. Those who are not ready for this will continue to work in the "Unity" as those who do not so far know what party to join or gravitate towards the "membership of two parties" incompatible with Bolshevism. Those who are engaged in splitting activities, covering themselves with the authority of the "Unity" and began to found their own "parties" and "unions" ought not to be admitted into the party, I think. We, of course, have no right to restrict the initiative of comrades here, but let them engage in this activity outside our party ranks and also the ranks of the "Unity", which cannot in principle be on the petty-bourgeois multiparty basis.

Thus it is necessary not to curtail but, on the contrary, extend and

perfect the activity of the "Unity", "Tokh" and other our socio-political movements and do all we can do to register them on the spot since obstacles to registration are created on the All-Union level. Work of comrades in these organizations ought to be considered important party assignment as the work in trade unions, strike committees, youth and other public organizations.

The theoretical basis of the party to be founded ought to be, not merely in words but in deeds, fundamental Marxism-Leninism taken as the philosophical-sociological, economic and socio-political grounds for the world-historic mission of the working class–to create classless society free from exploitation, oppression, wars and social injustice. Marxism-Leninism cleared of opportunist vulgarization and developed creatively in the contemporary conditions, but not developed in Gorbachev's manner by including in it the so-called "world humanitarian thought". The "enrichment" of scientific-proletarian theory proposed by renegades with ideas of Bernstein and Kautsky, Berdyayev and Martov, Trotsky and Bukharin, Dzilas and Lefevre, Willy Brandt and fathers of the Socialist International can only convert Marxism into petty-bourgeois anti-communist world outlook.

In the condition of restoration of capitalism in our country especially significant is the communist branch of the political thought and experience, which were rendered concrete and developed in the works and speeches of J. Stalin, Mao Zedong, G. Dimitrov, E. Thalmann, M. Thorez, P. Togliatti, Ho Chi Minh, D. Ibarruri, Kim Il Sung, F. Castro and other outstanding leaders of the international communist movement at the fountainhead of which V.I. Lenin stands.

It is known that opportunists, beginning with Khrushchev, confiscated from libraries and liquidated all that could help expose their apostasy. Young generation of party members were kept away from fundamental works of revolutionary Marxism for decades. Majority of the Soviet people of the age of 50 are not acquainted with the works and positions of the distinguished fighters for socialism of the mid-20th century. Even specialists do not know the genuine criticism of Khrushchev-Brezhnev's opportunism by the Chinese and other foreign communists. It is the criticism which now acquires special significance and appraisal which ought to be reconsidered in the light of contemporary events.

In our days even Lenin's works begin to be thrown away from the ornamental shelves in the cadre's offices and public libraries. The causes are understandable. The ideological poverty of restorationists is not to stand out in face of the increasing intellectual might of Leninist thought. Even in the condition of overall obscuration the texture and logic of Lenin's works speak for themselves. We ought to take measures to collect and preserve Lenin's works. Otherwise they can become such biographical rarity as J. V. Stalin's works

now are.

Reference to the historical and international revolutionary experience is necessary, of course, not for adducing quotations and not to mechanically copy in our days the formulation of problems, terms and solutions related to quite other times and conditions. Today we ought to take over from our predecessors and foreign brothers-in-arms, figuratively speaking, "not ashes but flame", that is, ability to overcome any difficulty, to be staunch in struggle, to find a way out of seemingly desperate situation, to be boundlessly faithful to the working class, to conduct irreconcilable struggle against revisionism and opportunism and master an arsenal of means and methods of defence of the interests of the working people.

In our days when Yeltsin got go-ahead for the realization in Russia of the full programme of the International Monetary Fund for neo-colonization of developing countries and secured emergency powers and began to "liberalize" prices, the bony hand of hunger and unemployment menaces the Soviet people. The working people already began to respond with strikes, which burst out in different regions. One or two years ago the "Unity" qualified with good reason strikes as the means of aggravating the heavy situation of people. Then restorationists only began to disrupt the economic system of socialism and the Soviet power. Except Baltic territories, strike movement then was provoked by "democrats" and could serve counterrevolution.

Now the situation radically changed. The great power, socialism and the Soviet power are in the stage of final destruction. In society bourgeois, nationalist and Mafia structures hold sway. In those conditions communists-Leninists ought not only to support but also together with trade unions become organizers of strikes of the workers for their rights, and impart this struggle urgent political character. But only general political strike with the decisive demand for removal of all restorationist structures in the capital and provinces can check the coming catastrophe. As a result of employment of different forms of civil disobedience transitional government ought to be established with a view to save the country from crisis and restore socialist system. Now this is the only path of avoiding civil war and foreign enslavement. Time does not wait!

The position of reaction in the country is strong but not omnipotent. Its anti-national character restricts prospect and historical possibility of bourgeois counterrevolution. Only the unity of the working class, the unity of the working people, can save the country. Path to this unity is arduous, but the truth of history is on our side. Direction along this path can be undertaken only by the Marxist-Leninist party, the "iron-willed cohorts of fighters", capable of breaking away from the opportunism of the CPSU and compromise and straightforward expressing the interests of the working people and helping them to be organized and inflicting defeat upon the restora-

tionists of capitalism.

Two days ago B. Yeltsin banned the Russian Communist Party and the CPSU. Today from all parts of the country we have gathered in the city of great Lenin to lay foundation of and start a new party which will take over and develop the revolutionary traditions of Bolshevism, the party which will always be faithful to the victorious banner of October Revolution and do all it can do so that the banner again flatters freely and victoriously over our Soviet motherland. We will emerge victorious under this banner!

Materials of the Constituent Congress of
the All-Union Bolshevik Communist Party
November 8, 1991
Leningrad, 1991, pp. 5-23

---

*Developing this theme in the article *Millions Crucified Today*, N.A. Andreyeva wrote, "Indeed after 1936 elections to the Soviets were conducted not by production districts but by territorial districts, which was an important yet not by far exhaustive step in the development of socialist democracy. The main thing here was that candidates for deputies were nominated by production and military collectives, which later ensured agitation for election of their candidates by population materially, organizationally and ideologically on the territorial level. If this was 'parliamentarism', it was socialist one having nothing to do with the system of perestroika. Gorbachev's perestroika acquainted the Soviet people with 'surprises' of bourgeois democratism and allowed anti-Soviets fraudulently to be elected to the Soviets, head and stage counterrevolutionary coup. Unfortunately, the theoreticians of the Russian Communist Workers' Party do not take it into account that perestroika only legalized the Right opportunism in the CPSU which gained strength long before perestroika, which objectively placed the party policy under the control of the 'Soviet' neo-bourgeoisie.... And finally, there is difference in the replies of the All-Union Bolshevik Communist Party and the Russian Communist Workers' Party to the basic questions of our times: What to do? What to begin with? The leaders of the Russian Communist Workers' Party consider that the main link in solving the whole questions is to create workers' councils in enterprises. They gradually ought to supersede the councils with anti-Soviet in its composition without destruction at all level and thus check restoration of capitalism and the ruin of the country. This aim has been pursued by the United Front of the Working People and the Communist Initiative already for two years and now by the Russian Communist Workers' Party, but so far there is no essential shift. True, the movement 'Working Russia' emerged from above, but it so far is engaged only in organizing meetings, marches, and 'marches to the White House'. The latter may fully convert into a kind of Gapon's scheme. As there were no new organs of alternative power in the enterprises in urban and rural areas, so there are not. In our view, the situation itself yet did not mature for the fulfilment of this task. Probably it is not necessary to begin with it. The ABCP sees the 'main link' of their activity in all-round assistance to the politicization of strikes of the working people. Its essence lies in establishing contacts with the collectives on strike, in preparing them to make political demands together with economic ones, in organizing aid to those on strike and in merging strikes into general process of expression of discontent with the anti-national policy of the government orientated to the restoration of capitalist relations. The highest form of peaceful resistance of the working people can be the general political strike which, when properly organized, can remove from power those who, deceiving people with promises, underhand effected counterrevolutionary coup, destroyed the USSR and now sent to disrupt even 'sovereign states'....

"The general political strike will liberate the initiative of the working people, raise the level of their political consciousness, restore the Soviets and other organs of political activity of the working people. These organs will make useless the present institutions of Presidency, gubernatorial system and other organs of counterrevolution and become direct executors of power of people and for people.... This is the 'basic chain' in the link of events, with a firm grip on which it is possible to inflict a decisive defeat on counterrevolution."

Judicial Newspaper No. 11 (29) for 1992, pp. 2-3.

* * *

SPEECH AT THE MEETING HELD AT PALACE SQUARE OF LENINGRAD, DECEMBER 22, 1991

Fellow countrymen,
Comrades and friends,
Brothers and sisters of common fate,

Those who do not consider themselves outside the united mighty state which has existed for thousands of years have gathered here at the historic square of Russia.

This great Power has been regarded as our common house in which many people have lived for centuries. It was also our dear home which our ancestors had reinforced and defended at the risk of their lives. They left to all of us a will that we should do so.

I am now speaking to you on behalf of the revived ABCP and of the direct successors to the party which dedicated the lives of its excellent sons and daughters numbering three millions to the altar of the Victory in the sacred war against the Hitlerite enemy. Of five million party members, three million! Name any other political party, if any, capable of displaying mass heroism for the glory of the fatherland! It is by no means accidental that during the war the combat report of the German generals from the eastern front to Hitler said that all the Soviet soldiers and the entire people were Bolsheviks.

Bolsheviks have no connection with despicable Gorbachev's party bureaucrats who broke away from communism or "dignitaries" of the party who changed one leading seat with another more profitable one.

Not long ago in the Belobez wood the "trois band" consisting of Yeltsin, Kravchuk and Shushkevich declared the "cessation of the Soviet Union" and signed the anti-constitutional treaty and hastily informed Bush of Washington that they realized without difficulties the plan Hitler had not accomplished. Yesterday ruling bourgeois nationalists in middle Asian and some other republics joined them. This sinister plot against the Soviet people was personally examined and approved by James Baker, Secretary of the US State Department. The history of our country had not ever seen more shameful and humiliating thing than this since the invasion of Mongol-Tatar.

The crushing bankruptcy of Presidents, local governors, mayors and other "democratic" buriers of motherland only brought about

one-kilometre-long queue of buyers standing before a shop, universal bitterness, fainting pupils from hunger and the old rummaging in garbage bins. The Yeltsin's reforms of "shock therapy" present the menace of the genocide of millions of people. So, in this peacetime they are threatened with death from starvation, cold, lack of drugs and rampant crime.

Apparently they smelt a rat. Rats began to flee from the captain's bridge of the sinking boat. At first Shatalin takes flight, followed by Gavriila Popov. Yakovlev and Shevardnadze imperceptibly changed their coat again and Sobchak, who hastily sent his "madam in turban" abroad to show off in super-markets there, murmured suspiciously as if nothing happened around him. And at last the first-rate traitor occupied the Presidential seat. Let them run! Their finish is one–to stand in the dock. Let us help them to reach there at the earliest date. With their irresponsible and mediocre politics, reformists-"democrats" led our country to the brink of a civil war. The hotbeds of war burst into flames in one region after another. Today to quench these flames became more difficult. There arose a problem of whether people may survive or not. Only the general political strike of the working people who insistently demand the resignation of all bourgeois, nationalist and Mafia structures of the political power in the centre and provinces can prevent today's tragedy. Today this is the only way to escape the civil war and subordination to foreign countries.

Time does not wait. The time for each of us to choose the way has come. The wheel of history is merciless to cowards and traitors.

Finally, only when all the honest-minded people are rallied around the anti-fascist patriotic united front, can the coming catastrophe be checked. Only by our own strength! Don't slander us in connection with the "we-first" principle, scribblers and mouthpieces representing so-called pseudo-democracy! Practically, fascism and reaction are approaching from the direction of Yeltsin, Kravchuk, Gamsakhurdi, Landsbergis, Sobchak and the like and dog-knights who restored capitalism and ruined our country.

In the face of a fatal danger hanging over the fatherland personal insult and little difference in views are trifle and insignificant differentiation in party and social trends looks trifling.

With the word "ours" the courageous images of our great ancestors rise before our mind's eye and join our ranks, encouraging us to fulfil our duty before our country which is in trouble.

Remember! The Soviet people did wait for "Our People" with hope in the territory occupied by Germans, on the heap of ashes of villages burnt down by the punitive forces, on the ruin of cities, in the camps and Gestapo's prisons! They waited and believed that "Our People" would come and rescue them and their motherland.

We have a lot of things to do in order to rise again to emulate

"Our People" in the grim days. We will do so without fail and rise up.

For the motherland crucified by the "leaders",
In memory of our fathers and in the name of our children
Let us uphold higher the purplish red flag,
Banner of struggle and hope of people!

Andropov Pravda, No. 3, February 1992
Murmansk City

* * *

AT THE POLITICAL CROSSROADS

After the CPSU collapsed and its activity was banned due to betrayal of its leadership in the political arena there appeared various parties, movements, associations and groups representing at times directly opposite social interests and their number is increasing. Difference of their demands, platforms, programmes and manifestos is fairly great and testifies to it that in the recent 3-4 decades under the roof of the CPSU, the ruling party, there have coexisted relatively peacefully Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, revisionists, dogmatists, Trotskyites, Bukharinites, nationalists, internationalists, patriots, cosmopolitans, monarchists, anarchists, "influential agents", Cheka men, future Cossack atamans and aristocrats missing their loss–variegated political show in the period of "democratic" restoration of capitalism in the USSR.

Of course, several million communists have devotedly built, strengthened and defended socialism for 70 years. However, they in fact were gradually deprived of the party to which they were admitted in the days of war and during the prewar five-year plans and postwar first Five-Year Plan. At first the drift of the CPSU to opportunism was disguised as Leninism and then legalized by Gorbachev and naturally went over to bourgeois counterrevolution. The 20th Congress of the CPSU, in our opinion, became a start of "sliding" towards the abyss of political inanity; anti-Stalin campaign which was officially described as "criticism of personality cult" played the part of ideological overture.

Objectively, this campaign did not shine in the sagacity of the government but led to the impairment of authority of socialism throughout the world, serious difficulties in the communist and working-class movement in the world, confrontation with the Chinese Communist Party and then between the USSR and the Chinese People's Republic and then to the activation of the opponents of socialism in East European countries. In the previous history of the

USSR, too, there were some preconditions for it, but the possibility of their realization was restricted by the state of proletarian dictatorship. When with the "shady" economy growing fast under the shade the Soviet state was converted into an "all-people" state and the CPSU, into a "party of all-people", the preconditions which were neutralized earlier developed into active factors which gave birth to the Gorbachev-style perestroika and all events ensuing from it.

Needless to say, it is not easy to reach such an "extreme" conclusion. Particularly it is so for the communists whose political consciousness was formed by the ideological "broth" of the Khrushchev-style "thaw" and who now form the majority. However, despite the desperate efforts of the "fathers of democracy" it is getting more difficult to ascribe to the "Stalin's repression" today's tragic state where millions of innocent Soviet people are dying, crippled and are made social outcasts in their native country. The brutal nationalists who were unpunished burn faces of living people with a soldering lamp, disembowel pregnant women and cut off noses, ears and sexual organs of those who are held in hostage; a respectful "democrat" Gamsakhurdi tortures his fellow countrymen with electric current; in the heart of Moscow watchdogs of the present regime beat war veterans including women on the plea that on the Day of the Soviet Army they went together to place flowers at the graves of Unknown Soldiers and Generals well-known to the world by the Kremlin wall.

Today one cannot convince many people that the present national humiliation of 300 million people is ascribable to J.V. Stalin. "The Stalin's system was not disastrous to Russia," writes priest B.N. Kiriyanov who had been repressed in the past, "but the devilish Gorbachev's system is full of treachery and deceptions unprecedented in history". It is difficult not to agree with him. This, however, does not mean that illegal repression is justifiable whenever and wherever it may take place.

When perestroika placed party's policy under the private control by entrepreneurs and businessmen, even those who in the party leadership were regarded as the successors to the Leninist line in the CPSU and those whom "democrats" accused of "dogmatism" and "conservatism" were not up to standard. When M. Gorbachev, A. Yakovlev and E. Shevardnadze adapted themselves to the interest of foreign and domestic capital, E. Ligachev, I. Polozkov and other "faithful Leninists" gradually "adapted" themselves to opportunism in the interests of maintenance of "peace and unity in the party". Hence opportunism completely gained the upper hand in the leadership of the CPSU, thus forming a link between the politics of capital and that of "faithful Leninists" and millions of Soviet communists lost their Marxist-Leninist staff and the country fell into the depths of disaster of the people.

At present the parties and movements of communist orientation

put forward various action programmes to prevent the final collapse of the USSR and a civil war whose flames already burned many Soviet people. Among the proposals there is a proposal to hold a Constituent Congress to define the form of government and that of convocation of a Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR in order to put an end to the policy of restorationists and capitulationists through the parliamentarian method. There are also initiatives. They are designed to convert the Soviets into the representative organs through a pre-term election, to set up the soviets in enterprises as alternatives to today's "democratic" Soviets and meetings and demonstrations under the slogans "Go to the White House", "Storm the Kremlin" or "Take away Smolny from the hand of Sobchak".

Most of these orientations of action have a solid ground and on the whole may play a definite role. However, in our opinion, they have one common fault, that is, they do not consider the possibilities of resisting the authorities which are yet incapable of defeating the intentions of champions of socialism and turning it in their favour. Therefore the ABCP considers that in the present conditions the course of events can be turned in a peaceful manner only by the general political strike which alone is able to disorganize the forces opposed to the working people, oust bankrupt restorationists from power in the capital and provinces, restore the government of the working class and its allies, introduce control of the working people over production and distribution everywhere and organize the self-defence corps of workers for the purpose of neutralizing the combat units of Mafia bourgeoisie.

We believe that occurrence of a "communist multi-party system" on the ruin of the CPSU is entirely a law-governed phenomenon. Examination into the causes of our historical setbacks and intensive search for a way out from the crisis are going on. Nobody can have the patent of truth. So, the attempts of different parties to monopolize it, exploiting the desire of party members for their unity, may only complicate more the prospect of genuine unity. The ABCP regards that placed on the agenda should be the unity of action of all communists in the struggle against restorationists, instead of unproductive discussion about "coordination" of platforms and programmes. The mass anti-restoration movement will practically lead to the choice of "viewpoint" and the "competition" of parties must not weaken the general offensive on the buriers of socialism.

We are also convinced that under the present conditions of confusion and vacillation the reanimation of the CPSU can never be helpful to cementing the unity of communists. The concord of party bureaucrats and entrepreneurs which is taking place behind the artificial reanimation of the CPSU will only give birth to the "supra-class" party of neo-perestroika which inevitably will take over the faults and shortcomings from the Gorbachev's leadership. In its activity the ABCP proceeds from the view that however dramatical-

ly the events may develop, the 20th century will go down in world history as a century of trials and errors in the socialist movement of the world. Because of its unfavourable circumstances socialism was not able to painlessly clear obstacles on the way laid by international capital. Unlike the current crucial century the coming 21st century, we think, will be a century of global transition to communist structure, the structure of not "market" but a genuine freedom and humanism, to which now all the roads of world civilization lead, independently of anyone's desire. Unfortunately, they are not so smooth as the pavement of Nevski Prospect.

The ABCP will spare nothing in order to bring earlier the day of victory of communism. We fought, fight and will fight for it.

Comsomolets Zapolyaria
of April 4, 1992,
Murmansk City

* * *

SPEECH AT THE MEETING OF PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS HELD AT PALACE SQUARE OF LENINGRAD, MARCH 17, 1992

Fellow countrymen,

The citizens of and guests to our great city on the River Neva,

Today not holiday mood but deep apprehension about our fatherland in trouble has brought us to the square well-known to the world. We here are different, hold different banners and differently evaluate our historical past, the causes of today's catastrophe, the alignment of social forces and the roles of different political parties and their leaders. But we want to see our fatherland be a single, mighty one which inspires not only our friends but our enemy with respect.

We hope that others come to us not for crude oil and gas or for so-called "brides for export" but for the state wisdom which the Western stock exchanges do not sell.

We all want to live in the society where the working people feel themselves like in their dear native home and where they are confident of their future, the future of their children, steady improvement of people's well-being and expansion of individual liberty. Today Mafia wormed their way into power deceiving the working people and with the help of the renegades from the CPSU. These political offenders defending the interests of economic offenders, frantically derive profit from chaos, corruption, the blood and tears of people, plundering everything which the previous and present generations have created through their labour.

In order to retain their power today's businessmen and corrupt politicians disunite the people including Slavs and set them against

each other. Having disrupted the single multi-nationality state, they set to destroy the so-called "sovereign states". They practise the principle "Separate and rule" in our country which had shown the model of fraternal mutual assistance and friendship between peoples of the world in the most crucial times in its history, the friendship that rescued mankind from the Hitlerite genocide and slavery.

Indeed, there arises a question; What can be divided between the steelmakers of Magnitka and coal-miners of Donets coalfields, between the farmers of Kazakhstan and mechanics of Byelorussia, between the oil-workers of Baku and the cotton growers of Uzbekistan, between the grape growers of Moldavia and the fishermen of Estonia? "Appropriators", businessmen and speculators are engaged in criminal sharing of all-people property: in the beginning they fleece neighbours to the common house and then pluck their fellow countrymen. In this they are helped by Presidents, provincial governors, local heads, mayors and deputies, being urged by the sponsors and investors from Washington and Bonn.

Now inflamed Russophobia holds a special place in the criminal activity of buriers of the great power. There arises a question why do they bear such hatred for the Russian people? Stalin best answered to this question at the reception given to generals at the Kremlin in the victorious year of 1945, I think.

First, he said, "Because the Russian nation is the most outstanding one among all the nations which constitute the Soviet Union".

Secondly, it is because the Russian people "is generally recognized as a leading force among all the peoples of our country."

What made it possible for the Russian people gather, unite, defend and liberate other peoples? "It is clear wisdom, firm character and patience," as the Supreme Commander always answered laconically and correctly.

It is by no means fortuitous that all Judas, turncoats and betrayers of Christ together with their masters behind the scenes are aiming at the very heart of the Great Power, at the Russian people, the working class, the Armed Forces and the judicial organs. Let us see that only the dock is in store for traitors. To do so, let each of us do all he can and more. Today all the people and each must defend the Soviet Fatherland as they did risking their lives the heights of Pulkov, in the snow in the suburbs of Moscow and in the trenches of Stalingrad and held out, annihilating the enemy.

At this crucial year of collapse, discord and treachery the main task is to unite and rally all people of good will. The Russian people, the working class, their patriotic political organizations and movements play again an important role in uniting and rallying social forces. Our strength lies in the unity of action! We support the Congress of the People's Deputies of the USSR who remembered their historic responsibility at last.

The time is nearing for us to oust merchants from the Temple

and effect overall civil disobedience to separatists. The time has come for all of us to prepare for a general political strike throughout the country, all-people's action to sweep away the reactionary government and prevent a civil war. Only justice, allegiance to the people, statehood and patriotism alone can bring declarations and manifestos into effect.

Some time ago I received a letter from a wise priest, my countryman who has tasted the sweets and bitters of life. He wrote: "The years of devilish enemies and destroyers are numbered. They will meet their end for what they had done. They are cursed. Retribution is in store for them. It will start in spring.... Everything will go well with Russia. We will see the new great Power and Glory. God bless us!"

With his true and firm belief the priest-patriot reminds us, believers of atheism, of our duty before our fatherland and ancestors.

Let us fulfil this sacred duty. We are Russians!

* * *

REALIGNMENT OF FORCES AND PROSPECT

It is needless to enumerate facts of aggravation of overall crisis which developed into the crisis of power which is unable of understanding and preventing catastrophe. Overall "liberalization" of prices engendered such overall impoverishment, dooming the whole strata of population to hungry existence and rapid extinction. So far they are socially defenceless strata incapable of organized protest but they increase, involving groups of people who are potentially capable of activity. Thrown into the whirlpool of speculation and petty business, the youth, losing the social landmark of the future, begin to think over their fate, driven by the obvious lowering of their living standards. Concentration of capital precipitates the ruin of cooperatives and small enterprises, causing transition of "cadres" to gangster-like criminal forms of "business", increase of crimes, overall immorality and extremist tendencies.

The worker sections of population lulled by the official propaganda strive to "pass the winter" and survive till the harvest of kitchen garden and "green" crops. There are manifested political weariness and apathy among the masses of the working people, which may burst out into flames of indignation of uncontrollable character. The experience of Karabakh, Osetia and other "hot spots" is instructive.

"Liberalization" of prices not only overtook overall conversion of all-people property into private property but also made it very dangerous.

Even "democrats" in local power organs think over the consequences of such gangster-like robbery though they themselves warm their hand over it. But this is not the main thing. The main thing is that the reverse of "conversion of all-people property into private property" is mass unemployment, which so far was artificially held back (collective leave without pay or with partial pay, short working weeks or days, payment for actual reporting to work). It is felt that the present rulers fear the future and seek contacts with the political forces of progressive orientation. Naturally they do not think earnestly to "share" power, however some "communist" leaders may dream about this.

The essence of problem, the axis of the present socio-political life, lies in the realignment of forces in the ruling class. The venal, compradore, pro-Western, cosmopolitanizing pro-Zionist neo-bourgeoisie which compromised itself is gradually being removed from the economic leadership over the restoration of capitalism. National capital carries greater weight. In the Russian Federation this is the Russian neo-bourgeoisie which was late in coming to the division of the Soviet "pie". Now it concentrates its intellectual forces, founds its political parties and seizes key links in the state organs. If the pro-Western clan of restorationists had their "democratic" base in the creative and other elite intellectuals and in the structure of the "democratic platform" of the CPSU, the present national capital only creates its social base or rather "seeks" it.

Its ideological support is nationalism, which, as concept, is now declared to be "invention of Jews" but not the real social phenomenon which is normally engendered by the epoch of early capitalism. In the sphere of politics this is stressed on the national statehood and patriotic parties and movement. But they are obviously insufficient and their state wants improvement. Hence bourgeois-democratic strivings for drawing socialist and even communist parties into the orbit of the same restorationist politics. The strength of national bourgeoisie lies in the state-patriotic principles by which many honest citizens and communists including servicemen may be lured in the period of disintegration of the great power.

Mass foundation of national capital is the petty-bourgeois strata in town and country. These strata which increase in the period of overall ruin are compelled to seek guarantee for the stability of their well-being in our unfortunate world falling to pieces and, at the same time, long to get richer on the limitless "appropriation". Today it obviously leans to the "state" principle without discerning at times whether it will be socialist or bourgeois one. From its dual character it is possible to explain the "floating" position of socialist parties and all present social democracy striving to maintain their innocence and acquire capital through the "equal right to all forms of property".

In the wake of different parties of "petty shopkeepers" alliance with national capital will be apparently formed by the "party-

nomenclatural" capital of the former CPSU, which was assimilated in a number of the branches of economy, but it is not sure of itself with the "despicable bureaucrats" who started seeking the money of the CPSU. The strength of this exotic capital is not economic but lies in the ties with the associations of the leaders of big enterprises and munition complexes which are not included in the "market economy".

The "despicable bureaucrats" who acceded to power rely abroad on the capital of the "civilized" countries holding the International Monetary Fund and the Zionist "Diaspora". Hence the support to the imperialist adventure in the near East in spite of the geopolitical interests of their own country. National capital receives aid from the Russian emigrant "Diaspora", that is, from the former landlord-bourgeois capital of the Russian emigrants. "Democrats" as well as their political opponents from the "patriotic" camp now intensively introduce their ideas and culture in the country. It is needless to explain that "patriotism" of bourgeoisie of any nationality is limited by the interests of its profit, however it may be covered up.

Strengthening its social base, national capital is not unwilling to flirt with communists, needless to say, with "moderate" ones capable of singing in accompaniment to it when opportunity offers, of course, out of "tactical considerations". It would be naive to suppose that Russian stockbrokers and businessmen are ready to share power with the working people through their political organizations. They may promise or slip the ministerial seat to some "communist" simpleton. And that temporarily, of course, to deprive him of the "post" later as if he failed to manage, attributing it to the inconsistency of the "communist ideas". So it happened more than once in Finland, Austria and other "civilized" countries.

Lastly, "democratic" capital will not give up power without reason. It is proved by the experience of Georgia where Shevardnadze assumed the specially established highest state post with his experience in carrying on "business" in the West and hundreds of thousands of dollars he "earned", being foreign minister under Gorbachev. National capital for the time being sustained defeat in the capacity of hapless Gamsakhurdi, having not withstood the new destructive thinking of the "roving diplomat" Shevardnadze. The humiliating international treaties, the blood-stained land of Osetia, Karabakh and provocations in Tbilisi will remain in our country as the unforgettable memory of him. .

In Azerbaijan the pendulum of political situation after Mutalobov's resignment swang to the other side, to the side of the interests of national "patriotic" bourgeoisie looking to the side of the neighbouring Islamic countries. The former member of the Politburo Geidar Aliev, "modest fellow", is evidently going to be counterbalance to it, but he will not be able to dispense with armed provocations as Shevardnadze. Increasing strifes of such "patriots" in the Russian parliament and government bespeak that denouement is nearing here too.

Situation demands from communists vigilance, exact appreciation of facts of political situation, analysis of alignment of social forces and constant contact with the masses of people. It seems to us that today for the whole "Left wing" the independent position and rejection of doubtful political play with bourgeoisie are desirable, for life and the future of the country is staked.

The broadest unity of Leftist parties and movements and formation of the "third force" on this base which is opposed to all varieties and fractions of neo-bourgeoisie acquire greater significance as never before.

However, not holding ministerial seats in the counterrevolutionary governments but advocating their independent policy and rallying the masses of people behind them, can socialist and genuinely patriotic forces defend the basic interests of the working people, check restoration and capitalization of the country, ensure a way out of crisis and genuine social progress. I think from this viewpoint that we should assess the event of March 17, 1992 in Moscow.

Above all, it is necessary to point out that the 6th Congress of People's Deputies of the Soviet Union was held in spite of all obstructions of the present authorities. The documents they adopted reproduced the basic mandates of the ABCP which were given them earlier. Of course, because these demands reflect the sentiments of the people everywhere and the shift in their consciousness. Our task is to give wide publicity to the resolutions of the congress as far as possible and go ahead, where possible, in the spirit of the programme of the ABCP. Particularly our comrades from provinces propose that the committees of support to the resolutions of the congress be founded and campaign for reelection of deputies who did not attend the congress be launched.

More complicated is the assessment of Moscow Veche and its resolutions. It is known that it was attended by many delegations of the ABCP from all regions of the country. In the sea of red flags were Bolshevik banners and placards though sponsors advised us not to "stick out". The critical spirit of Veche was strong. This was a huge school of political education and solidarity of the working people the significance of which it is difficult to overrate. Nevzorov was right when he declared that it was the beginning of a new stage of political struggle for the unity of the Union the flag of which was raised to the majestic sound of the hymn of the Soviet Union.

However, if we only confine us to the assessment of the phenomenon which is by no means of a single meaning, we will err from the truth. First, it is necessary to recognize that the position of the organizers of Veche was in consistent in anti-restoration. It was opposed only to one, the most shameful anti-patriotic branch of

restoration of capitalism, shading the other, supposedly "good", "patriotic" branch of the same process with formal "non-party character". The point here is not only tactics but something greater. Secondly, this position was not only anti-Bolshevik but also anti-communist one though communists, too, were elected to Duma. Predominance of red colour at Manezu Square was hypocritically attributed to the patriotic-minded people who attended it. Hence appeal for the refusal of confrontation between the "Whites" and the "Reds" as if the confrontation of those who live on their productive labour and those who, using private property, amass capital at the expense of others' labour were not an objective fact, which cannot be obliterated by the declaration of the "united opposition".

Without taking the global confrontation of labour with capital into account it is impossible to understand the genuine causes of riots of separatism and bloody national internecine wars and all that are taking place in our country after 1985. If the empty talk of pseudo Marxists of Yakovlev-Gorbachev's breed is thrown away, the denial of inevitability of the struggle of the "Reds" with the "Whites" is designed to serve as the support for the "change of guards" in the ruling circles of restorationists. They are now ready to tolerate and even use the red colour of the banner of proletarian solidarity of the working people in their egoistic interests. This is not because of their improved livelihood. Needless to say, half a million people who joined the huge Veche have nothing to do with the anti-communist undertone of scheme of its hidden inspirers.

"Patriotic" restoration of capitalism conflicts in principle with the historical law-governed process of progress as the current "mean bureaucratic" capitalism does, and, viewed in perspective, can be even more dangerous with its chauvinist and authoritarian tendencies.

Restoration of the Soviet Union, in our opinion, is only possible on the socialist basis since the unity of the great power and socialism are inseparably related with each other. No "Peter I" of the Russian national bourgeoisie is given to achieve this. Instead in their struggle for the "unified and indivisible Russia" they might plunge peoples of our country into endless wars, clashing in the expansionist gambling with their robbery colleagues–national bourgeoisie of the "independent states". Moreover, such "unification" of former Soviet republics might provoke occupation of a number of our regions by Germany, the United States and other present "allies" of NATO.

The Soviet Union can be saved and restored only by Russia becoming the Soviet socialist republic again to which will be drawn the working people of the former republics, having suffered much from disunity, disintegration and "sovereignty". Who now wants to ally with Yeltsinites and Kravchukites? Without them even Landsbergises and Snegurs will be deprived of possibility of hinting at the

Russian "expansion", which they are now excellently carrying out. The working people have nothing to share between them. In the unified Power they will be provided with prospect and worthwhile life when the multinational state again becomes socialist one. It is high time to speak out candidly here.

Today the question whether restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union has real prospect worries all. However dramatically events now may develop restorationists have or can have no historical prospect, for they act against the basic tendencies of social progress, I think. There was none who would perpetrate such acts without impunity. Our restorationists of bourgeois orders dream that three per cent wallow in luxury and 97 per cent of the fellow countrymen "till" the land for them without straightening themselves, but they will not get away with it. It is only the question of time and historical expense the scale of which depends on the organization and solidarity of the people.

In what do we think the present policy of restorationists and capitalizers conflicts with the basic vector of the socio-economic development of mankind? Let me dwell on individual points.

First, the general tendency of development of the productive forces is connected everywhere with the concentration of production and its internationalization. We destroyed the unified production-economic complex of the country and have reverse process of decentralization of production and property and its transfer to national quarters and regions. We gave up even the unified energetic system, which gave greater advantages in managing electric energy on the countrywide scale. In our country was concentrated only the capital detached from the production base, which confirms its parasitic, criminal, gangster-like speculative character.

Secondly, in the transnational monopolies there increases the planning character of economy, which we contemptuously gave up as the "vestige of socialism". This programmed its scientific-technical lag and, as the consequences, inability of our commodities to compete in the world market for long years. Hence, normal is the "leakage of brains" from the spheres in which we recently had the lead.

Thirdly, in societies of the same type in the socio-economic conditions the state frontiers lose the former significance on account of the economic causes of necessity of free transfer of capital and labour. We set up frontiers where they should not be. Economic and political disunity is fatal in the century of the scientific-technical revolution, but we continue to make for autonomy and seclusion as if to strive to return to the epoch of hereditary principalities.

Fourthly, the historical progress objectively washes away boundary between classes and social strata, having the tendency of making for social homogeneity. Today even monopoly capital asserts formal equality of social strata, covering it with the hypocritic demands for

defence of human rights. Reviving neo-bourgeoisie under this slogan, we are returning to open antagonism and direct confrontation in social sphere. In other words, restorationists here transfer us to the boundary of the 20th century, which, as is known, was fraught with national and social cataclysms. Returning back in a historical spiral, we expose those living now to the danger of civil wars of self-extinction, not to mention that we objectively increase the danger of world war.

Fifthly , from century to century, from decade to decade the acuteness of racial and national confrontation is being removed. In ethnic relations levelling and obliteration of racial and national boundaries are going on. Socialism openly declared the possibility of solving gradually this question on the basis of social property, and achieved here remarkable results, demonstrating brotherly mutual assistance and friendship of peoples to the world. Today in the United States negroes become generals and senators, stealing on the presidential seat. It makes no difference to monopoly capital who serves it. Even such enclave as the Republic of South Africa is "straightening out" the situation with apartheid. In our country the bourgeoisie which acceded to power not only disassociated peoples but also set them against one another, hoping at first to plunder the neighbours from the former common house and then come on their fellow countrymen.

Such facts can be enumerated further, but this will suffice to make conclusion about incompatibility between all the restorationist policies and the basic tendency of development of mankind. He who checks this development and puts a spoke in the wheel of progress, will be buried by it. But this does not happen of its own accord, but in the course of struggle of the masses of people for their economic and political rights. Our task is, relying on the laws of history, to help expose the retrograde myths of capitalizers, unravel political knots tightened by reaction and secure economic advantages and improvement of the well-being of those who are engaged in social production and do not oppress nor plunder others.

All these considerations inspire optimism in the conscious mouthpieces of unconscious objective historical process and confirm their confidence in the justness of their cause and in the inevitable victory of the working people over domestic and foreign reaction which spoils their life.

March 22, 1992, Leningrad — *Judicial Newspaper,* Nos. 27 and 28 for 1992, Moscow

* * *

IS IT NECESSARY TO REVIVE THE CPSU?

With each passing day this problem becomes more urgent one

affecting the interest of different and often opposite political forces. Millions of communists want to be legally in the ranks of the party to which they devoted all the best in their lives. The former party leadership that are now out of office have no objection to "come out of their trenches" and regain their former leading seats with all that are due to them. To top of it, frightened at the overall confusion and crisis, some strata of newly-emerging bourgeoisie, hope to have as their ally, the reanimated CPSU, though temporary, which will help them to soften the fatal blow and blunt the edge of anti-restoration movement in the country. It is by no means fortuitous that Yeltsin advised the newspaper *Pravda* "revived" after forced three-week silence to take a "democratic course somehow". I suppose that the Russian President might admit the "revival" of the CPSU.

The ABCP considers it pointless to "revive" the CPSU at present and premature at least.

First, in the recent 30 years under the roof of the CPSU, the ruling party, there coexisted relatively peacefully Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Trotskyites, Bukharinites, nationalists, internationalists, patriots, cosmopolitans, future anarchists, monarchists, Cossack atamans and local governors faithful to Yeltsin—the present variegated political show.

Secondly, the scale of treachery cannot be reduced only to the Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze clique though it is enough to characterize the "top echelon" of leadership of the CPSU and general political state of the party. Needless to say, in the Central Committee of the CPSU there were those who were considered to be the successors to the Leninist course. However, as the Gorbachev clique began to serve the foreign and domestic capital, "faithful Leninists" E. Ligachev, I. Polozkov and others gradually adapted themselves to opportunists-restorationists in the interest of maintenance of the "peace and unity of the party". As a result, opportunism completely gained the upper hand in the leadership of the CPSU, by forming a link between the policy of capital and that of "faithful Leninists". The Soviet communists lost their Marxist-Leninist general staff and our country fell into the depths of national disaster.

Thirdly, now in our country a lot of members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU and its secretaries are going strong as before. Who of them do now active fight for the ideals of their "revolutionary leading youth"? Nearly none. And that when tens of thousands of veteran members of the CPSU are fighting a hard battle with bourgeois counterrevolution. Apparently, as is said, "A big time found small generation of party leaders".

Fourthly, majority of the former party leadership from the secretaries of the Central Committee of the CPSU down to district party secretaries rushed into business, what restorationists expected. The

letters sent from provinces to the Central Committee of the ABCP wrote about many facts that party bureaucrats vie with "appropriators" not only in plundering the "inheritance" of the USSR but also in following the way of life they often deemed vulgar or bourgeois before perestroika.

Fifthly, many parties arose on the ruin of the CPSU and are active. Some of them broke away from Marxism-Leninism, some others, reflecting the position of "petty shopkeepers", play accompaniment of restorationists from the "Right" or "Left" centre, and yet some others maintain the position of the working class as the supporters of the party of a Leninist type. No matter how many programmes, platforms and manifestos were worked out and adjusted agreement, it is natural that there is no concord with them. Today the ranks of nationalist-communists who adapt the "socialist idea" to their diehard nationalism are increasing. To unite all of them under the roof of the "single CPSU" is harmful Utopia. The outcome will be another "Noah's Ark" in which the "cleanhanded" and the "unclean" would only be engrossed in elucidating relations, oblivious of the historical mission of the CPSU. Here the personal ambition of "leaders" who fattened will make for the mess.

Sixthly, in fact, the CPSU was not disbanded but simply dissolved itself, leaving its finance, publishing houses, buildings, hospitals and so on to the new rulers. For example, Gidaspov, the party leader of Petersburg, deceiving the bureau of the regional party, gave 65 million roubles to Sobchak (Former mayor of Petersburg and restorationist–*Ed.*) from the party coffers and even did not appear at Smolny when the buildings there were sealed. Even after this he duly received his pay for several months. How many such men are there in the whole country? None of them tried to appeal to communists and the Soviet people to help make the robbery of the party's property difficult if not prevent it. Apparently they did not need the support of the people. Perhaps they feared the people and sought their enemy's protection. For example, Soloviev, the party "leader" of Chelyabinsk, became the chief of provincial administration under Yeltsin and faithfully serves the Mafia neo-bourgeoisie.

Seventhly, it will for ever remain a shameful stigma for the CPSU that at the congresses the body of people's deputies of the USSR and republics over two-thirds of which were party members voted for all the anti-constitutional acts of bourgeois restorationists. In the body of people's deputies there was no one communist who would not give way to "parliamentary cretinism" as Lenin said.

With what rapidity the "principled" editorial staff of *Pravda* and other party publications changed!

At the same time the ABCP is decidedly opposed to every attempt to identify millions of communists loyal to the people with those who betrayed the ideals of the Leninist party, that is, the working people. The assertion that the hostile force of "feudalists-communists" and "bourgeois-democrats" stands in opposition to the working class and the working people does not agree with the reality. Behind these primitive Populism and naive "non-partisanship" are objectively concealed the interests of the present-day restorationists who fear a new stage of the unity of socialism and labour movement more than fire. However, this unity will be inevitably realized as the consciousness of the working people is enhanced in the struggle for their economic domination and political rights.

We consider as anti-constitutional and illegal the decrees of the President of the USSR of August 24 and the President of the Russian Federated Republic of August 25, 1991 which in fact outlawed the activity of the CPSU and flagrantly infringed on the political rights of Soviet communists. Therefore, the ABCP unconditionally supports the just demands for the repeal of these illegal acts. But this does not mean that we approve the attempt of party bureaucrats and their followers to convene a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the 29th Congress of the party disrupted and disgraced by them with a view to have their revenge on their recent defeat.

In the present conditions of confusion and vacillation the reanimation of the CPSU can be on no account helpful to the strengthening of unity of communists and the increase of militancy of their ranks. The recent concord of party bureaucrats and entrepreneurs that stands for the plans for the artificial reanimation of the CPSU will bring about nothing but the birth of a party of "supra-class" and a new perestroika which inevitably will inherit the defects of pro-Gorbachev's leadership.

Today a matter to be placed on the agenda is not the 29th Congress of the CPSU but the unity of actions of all the communists in the struggle against restorationists of capitalism and their lackeys. It is by no means a long, fruitless discussion for "adjustment" of programmes. For the formation of unity of actions it may be useful to summon a congress or a conference of the "Left" forces of the broadest communist representatives. Of course, the party of Bolsheviks-Leninists should not be "excluded" from these forces, though renegade B. Slavin who especially shows zeal in the "organizing committee" for the convocation of the 29th Congress of the CPSU demanded it through the newspaper *Pravda*.

We are convinced that a mass anti-restoration movement will practically lead to the choice of a platform and a "view point". Since practice is the basis and criterion of truth, social practice is better than any theoretical construction and discussions. Therefore, the historical "competition" (To choose one thing through discussion) of communist platforms and programmes should not weaken a general onslaught of the working class on the grave-diggers of socialism.

To unite the different parties which came into being on the ruins of the CPSU without preliminary demarcation may only weaken the

anti-restoration front of the working people. Therefore we regard the present attempt for reanimation of the CPSU as deception of communists on the part of those who shamelessly betrayed them and left them at the mercy of reaction which may develop into fascist regime.

Omsk Times, No. 1 for 1992, p. 2

* * *

SPEECH AT THE CELEBRATION OF MAY DAY ORGANIZED BY THE BELGIAN LABOUR PARTY MAY 1, 1992, BRUSSELS

Dear comrades and friends,
Brothers and sisters in labour and struggle,
The respected citizens of the glorious capital of Belgium,

Allow me to congratulate you on May Day, a holiday of spring and the awakening to a new life and the day of the international proletarian solidarity of the working people of all the countries! I'm extending congratulations to you on behalf of the Soviet people and Soviet communists waging hard struggle against buriers of socialism, restorationists of capitalism who not only betrayed the social achievements of the working people but also are disrupting the great Soviet State which declared peace to cottages and war to the palaces in 1917.

In each nation there are its heroes and traitors. But such treachery as the Right opportunist clique of Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze committed in the USSR is unknown in the history of any nation. The working people were deprived of the power in their country under false slogan of the renovation and strengthening of socialism. The fly-wheel of anti-communism came untwisted. The CPSU ruined by opportunists was banned. Internecine wars between republics have started. Completely innocent Soviet people are bleeding. The working people were thrown into the abyss of poverty and misfortune. Truth was practically confirmed before the whole world that opportunism in the long run will develop into the restoration of capitalism, if a fight against it is not waged.

Quite recently the Soviet people greeted May Day as their most favourite holiday, forming the May Day columns decorated with red buntings and flowers like in your square today. Smiling faces, songs, dances and laughter accompanied the columns of demonstrators. Today in many so-called "sovereign states" which came into being on the territory of the USSR May Day became a workday and in some other countries the May Day demonstrations and meetings were forbidden. It seems that bourgeois counterrevolution replaced people. Smile vanished from their faces, their laughter was extinguished and joy in their lives and pride in their motherland were deprived of and confidence in the future of their children was forfeited. The beautiful streets and squares of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and other cities converted into rummage bazaar or spontaneous markets where people often sell the last things they have to eke out a livelihood. Old men, students and pupils are starving. Mortality is rising; birth rate is falling catastrophically. This induces us to consider the restoration of capitalism as a genocide against our people.

We are grateful to the Europeans for their humanitarian aid. However, over 80% of it falls into the hands of speculators who plunder the working masses. Today our bankrupt rulers are touring the world over, begging credit. They are threatening the creditors, saying this is last chance for them to get rid of socialism and enter the European community. The point is in what capacity to enter. In the capacity of the source of supply of raw materials to the Western monopoly or that of cheap energy and working force? In the capacity of semi-colony for international capital? The International Monetary Fund which is today dictating its conditions to Yeltsin and Gaidar demands just this.

The resistance of the working people to the plans of homegrown Soviet bourgeois and foreign investors is growing not by days but by hours. Strikes are going on extensively and the anti-restoration front of the working masses is strengthened. The Soviet people warn the Western capital that they will not pay the debt bonds of bourgeois counterrevolutionaries, whatever signatures may be attached to them. Don't complain later that nobody notified them of this.

I, a delegate of the ABCP, am very glad to be with you at this square, see your faces and feel the warmth of your heart and your vigorous handshake. I feel myself among you like in my home and among my compatriots. I thank the Belgian Labour Party for inviting me to celebrate May Day with you.

Here I see grey-haired veterans of World War II, the Belgian fighters of anti-fascist resistance. On the eve of the second great May holiday, which is called the Day of Victory in our country, allow me to congratulate you and all the freedom-loving Belgians through you on the 47th anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism. The veterans of the Patriotic War of the Soviet people against the German fascist aggressors and many your comrades-in-arms who are many in our Bolshevik party requested me to send their congratulations to you. With great joy I fulfil their requests. I wish you, the veterans of World War II, good health, well-being and happy long years of life. Your feats are immune to time. Your glory will be immortal!

However dramatic the fate of my country may be today, the Soviet people know that the laws of history work for social progress and friendship, brotherhood and cooperation of the working people. The restoration of capitalism in the USSR can never turn back the wheels of history. The USSR and socialism will draw lessons from what took place in our country and revive. That time will not be so

far off as it may seem so from afar.

Dear comrades, allow me to proclaim on this memorable May Day:

Let peace, well-being, love and happiness always be in your families! Let the number of your friends increase and that of your enemies decrease!

Long live the workers—creators of material and mental values on the globe!

For peace without war, for labour without exploitation and for the worriless life, for the future of children!

Long live May Day—the holiday of spring, labour and renovation of the world!

Let us hold higher the banner of the international solidarity of the working people!

Workers of the world, unite!

Solidarity No. 20 (789),
May 6, 1992, Brussels
(In French)

* * *

SPEECH AT THE COMMEMORATION OF THE BELGIAN LABOUR PARTY IN MAY 1992

Dear comrades,

Ladies and gentlemen,

Respected personages present here,

Today our once great power, the Soviet Union is found in the grave overall crisis which grew into the crisis of power incapable of understanding and averting catastrophe.

Degradation of personality, morbid irreconcilability, lack of confidence, fear, despondency on the part of the broad sections of population have become the ominous reality of our social existence. As a result of the undisguised anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda many people lost ideological foundation and political landmark of socially worthwhile activity, and have become an easy prey of the adventurists from mass media, parliaments and presidency. Not all so far begin to realize the loss of recent well-being, social stability and personal security. But, inevitability of this realization is obvious.

Having converted the Soviet Union into the arena of political bargaining of bourgeois nationalists and Mafia clans, the main conductors of counterrevolution fear power confrontation with the working people, which, according to their words, presents a "fatal danger for the unexperienced class of the Soviet upstarts".

At the first stage of Gorbachev's restorationist perestroika the

resistance of the working people assumed the spontaneous and involuntary character. This manifests itself in the reduction of labour productivity, violation of production, public and military discipline, growth of immorality and crime, mass desertion from the army, disrespect to the President, government, the Supreme Soviet, local power organs, the growth of the number of suicide in which we evidently rank first in the world, the attempt of million people to withdraw from all public affairs and retire to personal life.

The press which went wild with obsequence and servility tries here to distort the objective picture. The mass media under the sway of anti-communists try to suggest that precisely the restorationists who try to introduce a system of private property and exploitation of man by man are the inspirers of human thoughts as if the Soviet people for more than 70 years were waiting for the capitalist orders and even monarchy. For confirmation of this the results of election campaigns and opinion polls are adduced. But, for example, only 65 per cent of the electors took part in the voting for the President of Russia.

Social statistics and public-opinion polls fully subjected to the restorationists fulfil the same function as the mass media which have become the "fourth power" in society in the manipulation of social consciousness of population. Social statistics is skilfully manipulated in shaping the political sentiments of population in the spirit suited to the "modelers". Public-opinion polls play the same role. What those in power want is predicted. This makes it possible to create a semblance of all people's support. It is true that within the country the working people begin to guess these manipulations but people abroad continue to believe in the high rating of our Presidents and reformers. What is the worth of, for example, slogans of our reformers, political and ideological representatives of their interests in the power organs and the mass media, the slogans about freedom, democracy and glasnost prevailing now in our country? It is not fortuitous that character common to humanity is formally attached to these slogans though they in reality have particularly class meaning and substance. Engels already warned workers that after their seizure of power all their opponents, "all the reactionary forces, would be united under the slogan of pure democracy". But does there exist "pure democracy" in the society which is divided into antagonistic classes by private property?

For example, can mass unemployment and impoverishment of the working people in the period of transition to capitalism from socialism be considered as "economic freedom" as they try to suggest to the Soviet people? Every day they come to be convinced in practice that this is the freedom for newly emerging stockbrokers, plutocrats, businessmen and speculators to plunder and exploit people. For millions of the working people the notorious conversion into private property or transfer of all people's property into private

hands which has recently been legalized—this is economic enslavement and subordination of the working people to the interests of swindlers and pilferers. To avoid the eyes of the public the working people are drawn to participate in this plunder of the public property. But the public property does not belong to the advocates of conversion into private property. This is the property of the entire people and its conversion into private property signifies plunder of the property not only of the working people who are alive but of posterity.

Current glasnost is accessible to those capable of buying publishing houses, newspapers, TV and radio-broadcasting stations so as to propagandize their interests as the interests common to humanity. The overwhelming majority of the Soviet people turned out to be farther from freedom of speech than ever in the history of the 20th century.

Particularly the restoration process in the Soviet Union had a disasterous effect on the international relations.

The Soviet neo-bourgeoisie made nationalism the implement of strengthening their economic sway.

Suggestion began to be made to the working people of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Moldavia and Ukraine that not only reorganizers-restorationists but also neighbouring republics and their peoples are to be blamed for economic difficulties. Hence, Lithuania for Lithuanians, Ukraine for Ukranians, Estonia for Estonians .... But in these republics there live many other nationalities, which built up the economy ravaged in the war and remained to live there. They are called "Russian-speaking population" to which belonged different nationalities who were now denied the citizenship of the "sovereign states" which emerged in place of the Soviet socialist republics. Thus started the inter-nationality discord, which developed into armed conflicts, bringing bleeding and sufferings to people in Caucasia and Moldavia.

Legal foundation for the collapse of the Soviet Union was laid by the "declaration of sovereignty of republics". With its adoption the main streams of the mined minerals and raw materials were re-addressed to the foregin markets, the destruction of the unique national economic complex of the country and rupture of economic ties between enterprises were legalized and in the consciousness of the masses of people the concept of the common destiny of the peoples inhabiting our country is gradually vanishing. There appeared hundreds of thousands of refugees driven out of the native land by the perestroika throes, "war of laws", that is, disregard of the laws of the Soviet Union in the "sovereign republics" and the riot of separatist bourgeois-nationalist forces oriented toward the collapse of the great power. It can be asserted that the restoration of capitalism in our country went through two stages in its development and is now on the threshold of the third stage. This is in essence the stage of cri-

sis of restoration on which I would like to dwell.

Toward the end of August 1991 was completed the first stage of "perestroika", the stage of crisis of restoration of capitalism, covered up by socialist phraseology. Chameleonic social-democratic path of restoration exhausted its possibilities. In this period the Right opportunist clique of Gorbachev, Yakovlev, Shevardnadze repealed the Constitution of the Soviet Union and wrested the working people of power, handing it over to anti-socialist forces. But these restorationist forces were disunited and could not realize the dictatorship of neo-bourgeoisie, meeting with resistance of the working people. In place of republics there emerged "sovereign states" with pluralism of power and regimes between which was launched struggle which went over to armed conflicts. Collapse of the Soviet Union began....

Gorbachev's comrades-in-arms in guidance over the country, members of the State Emergency Commission (Pavlov, Yanayev, Yazov, Kryuchkov and others) tried to check the overall economic, political and military collapse in Gorbachev's manner with a view to preserve the country, the unified state.

But, devoted to their President, they sustained defeat, and were thrown into prison which was labeled "Matroskaya Tishina". Gorbachev, chief conspirator and arch-betrayer, remained at large, though he lost the highest state post. In the light of criminal code, all his activity at this post was detrimental to the "sovereignty, territorial integrity and state security of the Soviet Union".

Apparently it is not fortuitous that before his resignation Gorbachev made arrangement with Yeltsin not only about two hundred guards and servants but also about the status of "inviolability of person", the status of immunity which diplomats accredited to a foreign state have. Is this not the indirect admission of high treason?

The second stage of restoration process was headed by the go-getting command of Yeltsin, Gaidar and Burbulis. Politely inducing Gorbachev to resign, they undertook with the confidence of an amateur to complete the started affair of final disintegration of the great power, plunder of people and enrichment of domestic and foreign capital. At this stage the reformers met not only with the spontaneous resistance of the people but also with the discontent of bourgeois-nationalist Mafias. Under their pressure, in the Belovezh forest reserve where Göring once hunted, Yeltsin, Kravchuk and Shushkevich declared "cessation of the Union", annulment of the Union treaty of 1922. After signing the anti-constitutional treaty, these trio hastened to report to President Bush in Washington how easily they succeeded in carrying through the unrealized plans of Hitler. Then this treaty was joined by the ruling bourgeois nationalists of the Middle Asian republics.

Now it is understandable that the bourgeois rulers needed the understanding in the Belovezh forest reserve to check the process of disintegration of the "sovereign states" themselves. To this end were

confirmed the existing frontiers between the former republics which under socialism were established fairly conditionally and the Russian speaking population reduced to the citizens of the second rank were left to the mercy of fate. The main thing is that the division of the Soviet Armed Forces, and separate lodging of troops and units in national quarters started. On the instructions of the West munitions units are dismantled and space techniques are sold for next to nothing.

The attempt of "Yeltsin's command" to force the process of restoration of capitalism led to the aggravation of crisis and all social contradictions and to the disintegration of the country and the initial management structure of catering for people's livelihood. The so-called "liberalization of prices" started in the beginning of 1992 which was aimed to accelerate conversion of all people's property into private property has already led to over-inflation or complete depreciation of rouble. On the one hand, this made more than 80 per cent of population pass the limits of poverty and led to genocide and the extinction of the old and less defended sections of population. Prices soared by 20-50-100 times but salary, wages, pension and student scholarships rose only 2 -3 times. The so-called "consumer's basket" constituted 3,814 roubles in April, but the average salary of medical workers was 774 roubles. As university instructor I receive 1,200 roubles, which also constitutes one-third of the "consumer's basket".

Schoolchildren fainting from hunger, anemic students with sallow complexion from undernourishment who are now compelled to pay tuition fees in university or college, young women standing in a queue to offer blood and receive a package of dry milk for baby instead, the milk delivered to us as humanitarian aid—this is the ordinary picture of the Russian reality. 80 per cent of the so-called humanitarian aid falls into the hands of speculators and its total amount for a person does not exceed 100-150 grammes a year, which does not solve the problem. In the shops there were no butter and granulated sugar for two months. A box of chocolate now costs more than the average month wages of the Soviet citizens.

Clusters of anger against the restorationists are maturing in the midst of population, which worries our neo-bourgeoisie and foreign investors.

On the other hand, the reform of Yeltsin-Gaidar's "shock treatment" enables the foreign monopolies to purchase a number of branches of production, the national treasure of irrecoverable natural wealth and the sources of energy and plunder the result of labour of the present and past generations of the Soviet people, converting yesterday's superpower into the raw-material appendage and the semi-colony of the international capital.

Already in December 1990 in Brussels the international banks decided that the land in the Soviet Union will be mortgaged for debts but not in kind but in the form of documents and shares in the

management over our land for 99 years, with the following extension of agreement. Almost in the same way Alaska was sold in its time.... All the territory of the Soviet Union may fall to such a lot.

The third stage of crisis of restoration process is ripening. The country is on the threshold of mass unemployment, which so far had hidden character and was artificially checked: this is collective leave without pay, to which a number of factory collectives are sent, short working days and weeks, or payment only for actual reporting for work, or advance sending of people to miserable retirement and the like. Rumour is afloat that it is high time to sacrifice Yeltsin in favour of the bloc of Vice-President Rutskoy and the chairman of the Russian parliament Khasbulatov who are repainting themselves as the patriots of anti-Yeltsin tone.

It is difficult to predict the development of events in Russia. The essence of problem the axis of political life lies in the realignment of forces in the ruling class. The venal, compradore, pro-Western and cosmopolitanizing neo-bourgeoisie which compromised itself is gradually being removed from the economic leadership over the restoration of capitalism. National capital which concentrates its intellectual forces, founds its political parties and seizes the key links in the state organs attains more weight. If the pro-Western clan of restorationists had their own so-called "democratic" base in the creative and other elite intellectuals, in the structures of the "democratic platform" in the CPSU, the present national capital only creates or rather "seeks" the social base for it.

Its ideological basis is nationalism. In the sphere of politics it is stress on national statehood and patriotic parties and movement.

Mass basis of national capital is the petty-bourgeois sections of town and city, whose interests different so-called socialist parties and particularly the Socialist Party of the Working People of Russia represent.

In the wake of such different parties of "petty shopkeepers" an alliance with national capital apparently will be entered into by the "party-nomenclatural" capital of the former CPSU, which was assimilated in a number of branches of economy but feels itself uneasy with the rabid "democrats" who undertook to seek the "money of the CPSU".

The strength of this exotic capital is not economic one but rather lies in the maintained links with the "associations" of leaders of big enterprises and munition complexes which are not drawn into the "market economy".

The "democrats" who acceded to power rely abroad on the capital of the "civilized" countries which holds the International Monetary Fund and also on the Zionist "Diaspora". Hence our government's support to the imperialist adventure in the near East in spite of the geopolitical interests of its country. National capital receives aid from the Russian emigrant's "Diaspora", that is, the former land-

lord-bourgeois capital of Russian emigrants. The "democrats" as well as their political opponents from the "patriotic" camp are now intensively introducing their ideas and culture into the country. It is needless to explain that patriotism of bourgeoisie of any nationality is bounded by the interests of its profit however it is covered up.

Having consolidated its social base, national capital is not unwilling to flirt with communists, needless to say, with moderate ones, that is, those who are capable of "singing in accompaniment" to him when opportunity offers, of course, from "tactical considerations". It would be naive to think that Russian stockbrokers and businessmen are ready to share power with the working people through their political organizations. But it may happen that they promise to offer or slip a ministerial seat to any "young ignoramus" –communist, temporarily, of course, to deprive him of the "post" later as if he is incapable of managing, ascribing it to the inconsistency of "communist ideas". Thus it happened more than once. There is historical experience in the "civilized states".

Lastly, "democratic" capital will not give up power without reason. It is proved by the experience of Georgia where Shevardnadze assumed the specially established highest state post with his experience in carrying on "business" in the West and hundreds of thousands of dollars he "earned", being foreign minister under Gorbachev. National capital for the time being sustained defeat in the capacity of hapless Gamsakhudi, having not withstood the new destructive thinking of the "roving diplomat" Shevardnadze, as unforgettable memory of whom will remain in our country the humiliating international treaties, the blood-stained land of Osetia, Karabakh and provocations in Tbilisi.

In Azerbaijan the pendulum of political situation after Mutalobov's resignation swang to the other side, to the side of the interests of national "patriotic" bourgeoisie looking to the side of the neighbouring Islamic countries. The former member of the Political Bureau Geidar Aliev, "modest fellow", is evidently going to be a counterbalance to it, but he will not be able to dispense with armed provocations as Shevardnadze. Increasing strifes of such "patriots" in the Russian parliament and government bespeak that denouement is nearing here too.

However, not holding ministerial seats in the counterrevolutionary governments but advocating their independent policy and rallying the masses of people behind them, socialist and genuinely patriotic forces can defend the basic interests of the working people, check restoration and capitalization of the country, ensure a way out of crisis and genuine social progress. I think from this viewpoint that we should assess the event of March 17, 1992 in Moscow.

Above all, it is necessary to point out that the 6th Congress of People's Deputies of the Soviet Union was held in spite of all obstructions of the present authorities. The documents they adopted

reproduced the basic mandates of the ABCP which were given them earlier. Of course, because these demands reflect the sentiments of the people everywhere and the shift in their consciousness.

Without taking the global confrontation of labour with capital into account it is impossible to understand the genuine causes of riots of separatism and bloody national internecine wars and all that are taking place in our country after 1985. If the empty talk of pseudo Marxists is thrown away, the denial of inevitability of the struggle of the "Reds" with the "Whites" is designed to serve as the support for the "change of guards" in the ruling circles of restorationists who are now ready to tolerate and even use the red colour of the banner of proletarian solidarity of the working people in their egoistic interests.

"Patriotic" restoration of capitalism conflicts in principle with the historical law-governed process of progress as the current "mean bureaucratic" capitalism does, and, viewed in perspective, can be even more dangerous with its chauvinist and authoritarian tendencies.

At the April 6th Congress of People's Deputies of Russia which just closed the representatives of national Russian capital succeeded in creating considerable opposition to the present regime. Yeltsin and his government was subjected to bitter criticism in which Khasbulatov "speaker of parliament" of Russia took part. But this time potential political energy was still insufficient to remove the representatives of pro-Western politicizing capital from power. The two sides made mutual concessions and arranged mutual compromise. Yeltsin checked conversion of the "parliamentarian republic" into the "presidential republic" and threatened the congress with the possibility of dissolving it as the "vestige" of the Soviet system. But he promised to check the "shock treatment" and impoverishment of population as well. Introduction of new prices for fuel (petroleum, gasoline, coal and gas) immediately after the session of the congress gave beginning to the new spiral of several-fold rise of prices.

Restoration of the Soviet Union, in our opinion, is only possible on the socialist basis since the unity of the great power and socialism are inseparably related with each other. No leaders of Russian national bourgeoisie are given to achieve this. Instead in their struggle for the "unified and indivisible Russia" they might plunge peoples of our country into endless wars, clashing in the expansionist gambling with their robbery colleagues–national bourgeoisie of the "independent states". Moreover, such "unification" of former Soviet republics might provoke occupation of a number of our regions by Germany, the United States and our other present "allies" of NATO.

Today the Union can be saved and restored only by Russia becoming Soviet socialist state again to which will be drawn the working people of the former republics, having suffered much from disunity, disintegration and "sovereignty". Who now wants to ally

with Yeltsin? On this is based the separatist policy of Ladsbergis in Lithuania, Snegur in Moldavia, Kravchuk in Ukraine. The working people begin to understand that only in the unified great power they will be provided with security and worthwhile life. But such multi-national great power must and can be only socialist one.

The main tragedy now lies in that the working class lost the leading role in society and their political strong point—organization. The CPSU slid down to Right opportunism for the last three-four decades, bringing with it a number of friendly communist parties into the abyss of political nonexistence. In the years of Gorbachev's perestroika Right opportunism gradually converted into bourgeois restorationism. The CPSU as a party of all people is liquidated and is generally removed from the political arena after the betrayal of its General Secretary. All the opportunist leadership of the CC of the CPSU of the '60s-'90s is to blame for this but not millions of communists who fell victims to the unprecedented betrayal.

In our days three basic groups of political parties and movement are being organized on the ruins of the CPSU. One of them is Right anti-communist ones which came from the former "democratic platform" in the CPSU. The second is the social-democratic one, the former pro-Gorbachev "centre". The third trend subjected to the scathing criticism of Gorbachevites as well as rabid "democrats" and reformers is communist, Marxist-Leninist one.

After August events in 1991 the fraction of the "democratic platform" was reorganized into the People's Democratic Party of Free Russia headed by Vice-President A. Rutskoy. Opposition position of this party does not go beyond the limits of bourgeois liberalism. It supports the conversion of all people's property into private property and private property from the position of the party of the "middle class of entrepreneurs". Decisively disassociating itself from the ideology of the CPSU, it pretends to its property.

The political course of this party is unstable. Recently it receives patriotic colouring. The financial base of this party is consolidated.

Assigned to support the "unpopular reforms" of Yeltsin, the People's Democratic Party of Rutskoy transforms itself into its liberal opposition. Breaking away from Marxist phraseology, it clang to the pseudo patriotic float.

The central place among renegades and apostates is now held by the Socialist Party of the Working People of Russia which has emerged under the private patronage of the former members of the Political Bureau of the CC of the CPSU on the initiative of the party bureaucrats, deputies, cosmonauts and "dissident Marxists". Its leaders Roi Medvedev and professor A. Denisov demanded that it give up the "Utopian Marxist and Bolshevik doctrine and become a party of sound meaning". They call for "peaceful transition to capitalism" and "preponderence of private enterprising in the sphere of service". According to certain information Gorbachev succeeded in creating

financial base from the CPSU treasury for socialists, conveyed them some small enterprises and cooperatives.

The basic task of the Socialist Party of the Working People is to play the role of political buffer between the supporters of socialism and capitalizers of the country, neutralize and confuse all the potential opponents of restoration of capitalism. Today socialists are forming a bloc with the bourgeois-restorationist "movement for democratic reforms" represented by such veterans of Gorbachev's perestroika as Yakovlev, Shevardnadze and Bolsky. The leadership of the socialist party supports the anti-national reforms of "Yeltsin's team", timidly attempting to criticize it for excess. The leadership is included in the "brain centre" of the Russian President.

The party bureaucrats who went bankrupt and longed for the seats of leaders in the CPSU founded a number of territorial and national communist parties such as the Communist Party of Yakut and the Communist Party of Krasnodon Region. As to their ideo-political positions all of them are close to the last programmatic orientation of the CC of the CPSU. This orientation, as is known, reflected the shift of the CPSU to social-democratism and Right opportunism. The ideas of national-communism which reflected the positions of bourgeois nationalism received considerable dissemination among national communist parties.

For the restorationists such "communist" multi-party system, on the one hand, has an important aim—to obstruct rallying of sound forces of the former CPSU on the Marxist-Leninist platform. On the other hand, the "communist multi-party system" on the ruins of the CPSU is fully normal phenomenon. Today the causes of the temporary historical defeat of socialism in the Soviet Union and East European countries are being clarified in an all-round way and a way out of crisis in the international communist movement is being intensively sought. Today the Marxist-Leninist potential of the CPSU is inherited and is being developed by the Russian Communist Workers' Party and the ABCP.

The ABCP takes it as the main orientation of its activity to help politicization of strike struggle of the working people. Overall political strike can be the highest constitutional form of resistance of the working people. It is the last possibility and the only real chance of removing from power those who betrayed the national and social interests of the Soviet people. At the instance of the party bureaucrats there now arose question: Is it necessary to revive the CPSU? The ABCP considers the revival of the CPSU is now pointless or untimely.

In the first place, Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Trotskyites, Bukharinites, nationalists and internationalists, patriots and cosmopolitans, future anarchists, monarchists, Cossack chieftains and Yeltsin's followers, that is, all the diverse political groups coexisted rather placidly under the roof of the CPSU as the ruling party for the

last three decades.

Secondly, the scale of betrayal cannot be reduced only to the clique of Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze-Yeltsin, though it would suffice to characterize the "upper echelon" of the leadership of the CPSU and all the political situation of the party. Of course there were in the central committee those who were considered followers of Lenin's course. But when Gorbachev's clique acted in the service of foreign and homegrown capital the "faithful Leninists" E. Ligachev, I. Polozkov and others gradually adapted themselves to opportunists-restorationists in the interests of preservation of "peace and unity of the party". Hence opportunism completely gained the upper hand in the leadership of the CPSU, forming a link between the politics of capital and politics of "faithful Leninists". The Soviet communists remained without their Marxist-Leninist headquarters and the country slid down to the abyss of people's disasters.

Thirdly, many former members of the Political Bureau, secretaries of the Central Committee of the CPSU are now going strong in the country. Who of them actively upholds the ideals of his "revolutionary-leading youth"? Almost none.And this happens when tens of thousands of veterans of the CPSU are fighting an unequal battle against bourgeois counterrevolution.

Obviously, as is said, "the big time found little generation" of the party leaders.

Fourthly, very considerable part of the former party leadership, ranging from the secretaries of the central committee to the secretaries of district committees hurled themsleves into business, which the restorationists expected. The letters sent to the CC of the ABCP from provinces adduce many facts showing how party bureaucrats compete with "appropriators" not only in the robbery of the legacy of the Soviet Union but also in the way of life, which often was petty bourgeois or bourgeois one with them even before perestroika.

Fifthly, a number of parties have emerged and are functioning on the ruins of the CPSU. Some of them broke away from Marxism-Leninism, some others, reflecting the positions of the "petty shopkeepers", sing in the accompaniment of the restorationists from the "Right" or "Left" side of centre, and yet some others remain on the position of the working class and supporters of the Lenin-type party. It is natural that there is no concord among them, however many programmes, platforms and manifestos may be written or coordinated. Today the ranks of the national communists tune "socialist idea" to the pitch of their diehard nationalism. To unify all of them under the roof of the "unified CPSU" is a harmful Utopia. The outcome will be only the regular "Noah's Ark" where the "clean" and "unclean" men would be absorbed in ascertaining relations, forgetting the historical mission of the CPSU. Personal ambition of multiplied "leaders" will work here on the ruins, too.

Sixthly, the CPSU practically was not dissolved but simply

broke up itself, handing over finances, publishing houses, buildings, hospitals and others to the new rulers. Thus, Petersburg's party leader Gidaspov handed over to Sobchak 65 million rubles from the party treasury and even did not appear in Smolny when it was sealed. How many such persons were in the whole country? None of them even tried to appeal to communists and Soviet citizens to help even make the robbery of the property of the CPSU difficult if not prevent. They obviously did not need the support of people and maybe even feared it.

Finally, seventhly, it will remain for ever as shameful stigma for the CPSU that at the congresses the body of people's deputies of the Union and republics more than two-thirds of which were party members loyally voted for all the anti-Constitutional acts of bourgeois restoration. There was no one communist who would not yield, according to Lenin, to the "parliamentarian imbecility". How rapidly the "principled" journalist staff of *Pravda* and other party publications reformed itself!

Moreover, the ABCP is resolutely opposed to any attempt to identify millions of communists faithful to the people with those who betrayed the ideals of Lenin's party, namely, the working people.

We consider and assess also as anti-constitutional and illegitimate the decrees of the President of the Soviet Union dated August 24 and the President of the RSFSR dated August 25, 1991, by which the activity of the CPSU was actually outlawed and the political rights of Soviet communists were flagrantly violated.

In the contemporary conditions of confusion and vacillation reanimation of the CPSU cannot promote the consolidation of unity of communists and enhancement of militancy of their ranks. The present concord of party bureaucrats and entrepreneurs standing for the plans of artificial reanimation of the CPSU can give nothing but "supra-class" party of neo-perestroika inheriting inevitably the demerits of Gorbachev's leadership.

On the list of priorities is not placed the 29th Congress of the CPSU but the unity of actions of all communists in the struggle with the restorationists of capitalism and their lackeys.

In our days the countries building socialism in East and South-east Asia and also the heroic Cuba have particular significance for the progressive mankind. Today imperialism is concentrating its blows and subversive activity precisely against them. On the shoulders of the peoples and communists of these countries rest the heavy historical responsibility of withstanding and not allowing opportunism in their parties and ensuring advance of their countries to socialism and communism.

In our times the communists and revolutionaries of the world, all the international and working-class movement, following the principles of proletarian internationalism, should offer unreserved support

to all the countries building socialism and defend them from the attacks and provocations of imperialism. Consolidation of socialism in Aisan and Latin-American countries in their turn will exert a wholesome influence on the processes going on in the Soviet Union and East European countries. We are convinced that world socialism will emerge from this crisis more powerful and consolidated and cleared of opportunist and revisionist filth. For this there are all objective and subjective grounds. None will forgive us if we will not take advantage of them.

In conclusion I will refer to the question: Has restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union real prospect? We consider however dramatically events may develop the restorationists have not and cannot have historical prospect, for they act against the basic tendencies of social progress of mankind.

First, the general tendency of development of the productive forces are related everywhere with the concentration of production and its internationalization. We destroyed the unified production economic complex of the country and have reverse process of decentralization of production and property and its transfer to national quarters and regions. We even gave up the unified system of energy which gave greater advantages in managing electric energy on the scale of the country. In our country only capital isolated from the production base is concentrated, which confirms its criminal, predatory-speculative character.

Secondly, in transnational monopolies increases the planning character, which we contemptuously gave up as the "vestige of socialism". Hence we programmed our scientific-technical lag and, as its consequences, the inability of our commodities to compete in the world market for long years. It is natural to cause the "leakage of brains" from the spheres where we recently had the lead.

Thirdly, in societies of the same type in the socio-economic conditions the state frontiers lose the former significance on account of the economic causes of necessity of free transfer of capital and labour. We set up frontiers where they should not be. Economic and political disunity is fatal in the century of the scientific-technical revolution, but we continue to make for seclusion as if to strive to return to the epoch of hereditary principalities.

Fourthly, The historical progress objectively washes away the boundary between classes and social stratums, having the tendency of making for social homogeneity. Today even monopoly capital asserts formal equality of social stratums, covering it with the hypocritic demands of defence of human rights. Reviving neo-bourgeoisie under this slogan, we are returning to open antagonism and direct confrontation in social sphere.

Fifthly, from century to century, from decade to decade the acuteness of racial and national confrontation is being removed. In ethnic relations levelling and obliteration of racial and national

boundaries are going on. It makes no difference to monopoly capital who serves it. Our bourgeoisie which acceded to power not only dissociated peoples but also set them against one another. Such facts can be enumerated further, but this will suffice to make conclusion about incompatibility between all the restorationist policies and the basic tendency of development of mankind. He who checks this development and puts a spoke in the wheel of progress, will be buried by it. But this does not happen of its own accord, but in the course of struggle of the masses of people for their economic and political rights. Our task is, relying on the laws of history, to help expose the retrograde myths of capitalizers, unravel political knots tightened by reaction and secure economic advantages and improvement of the well-being of those who are engaged in social production and do not oppress nor plunder others.

All these considerations inspire optimism in the conscious mouthpieces of unconscious objective historical process, confirm their confidence in the justness of their cause and in the inevitable victory of the working people over domestic and foreign reaction.

The laws of history work for socialism and communism. However dramatic the situation may be, imperialism will inevitably sustain defeat. The last word in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism belongs to the people. This is a just cause and the working people will emerge victorious. Let us uphold the banner of proletarian solidarity of the working people. Victory is in store for us.

* * *

ANTI-STALINISM IS A TROJAN HORSE IN THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN THE LATTER HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Speech Delivered in Belgium in May 1992

Ladies and gentlemen, esteemed audience,

Respected Comrades, making a speech on this problem before you, I want to stress straight that I take up the given thema proceeding from the need of the current fight against the restoration of capitalism in the USSR and the activity of the All-Union Bolshevik Communist Party (ABCP) whose leadership member I am.

We think that our keen attention should be directed to anti-communism in the countries of the so-called Commonwealth of the Independent States and it can be critically overcome only on the serious scientific basis of historical researches in all spheres of social sciences. It is necessary to make unprejudiced investigation of extensive material of archives and other sources so as to form a full

idea of the conflicting processes taking place in our country and the world communist movement in the transition period from capitalism to socialism. I now can speak only about certain approaches to the fulfilment of this task. Falsification of the history of socialist construction went to such an extent that considerable time is needed to overcome it and make an exhaustive conclusion and appraisal. Not only the Soviet communists but also all the Marxist-Leninist parties fighting for the power of the working people ought to occupy themselves with these problems.

In 1985 with Gorbachev's perestroika referred to on the pages of scientific and political writings there appeared the term "Stalinism", which pseudo democrats and revisionists set forth as the antipode of Leninism. "Stalinism" was given out as a brake on the development and renovation of socialism.

As is known, J.V. Stalin never used such term, stressing always that he was a student, namely, only the successor to the cause of V.I. Lenin. The undisguised anti-communist character of the attack on "Stalinism" compelled even Gorbachev to refer to this problem. In his answer to the questions raised by the *Humanite* about the "removal of the survivals of Stalinism" in 1986 he declared, "Stalinism—this is the conception invented by the opponents of communism and is widely employed to slander the Soviet Union and socialism as a whole." (Gorbachev, *Selected Speeches and Essays*, Moscow, Politizdat, 1987, Vol. 3, p. 162.) Evidently, in this reply was reflected the deepening understanding of many Soviet communists that the stagnation in the '80s in the USSR was connected not with Stalin but with the opportunist leadership of Khrushchev, which cleared the way for the stagnative phenomena of Brezhnev's period. Ideological preparation of anti-Stalin hysteria required time.

But after two years Gorbachev spoke about "Stalin's crimes", replacing the term "Stalinism" with the similar term "Stalin's regime".

"Green light" was given to the anti-Stalin hysteria.

The campaign assumed the complete party-state form. Therefore, when I adduced W. Churchill's comment on Stalin's activity in my article "I Cannot Give up Principles", I and the newspaper *Soviet Russia* which carried my article in March 1988 received a barrage of accusations lodged by the Central Committee of the CPSU, state organs, men of culture, all the mass media. As is known, the Political Bureau debated this problem for two days and entrusted it to A.N. Yakovlev, the then secretary of the Central Committee of CPSU to give an answer in *Pravda* to the "writer of the manifesto of the forces opposed to perestroika" and "Stalinist". This history not only revealed the class essence of Gorbachev's perestroika but also the genuine price of his assurance concerning the pluralism of opinions.

We think that the term "Stalin's regime" as well as "Stalinism"

is unscientific and fulfils the function of grounding anti-communism. At the same time it seems to be fully justified to speak about the regime of Stalin's party-state leadership conditioned by the peculiarities of socialist construction in one country. These peculiarities had objective character and were connected with the peculiarities of the proletarian revolution and the class struggle in Russia, which ought to be taken into account.

It is known that the October Socialist Revolution in Russia as well as the great French bourgeois revolution of the 18th century had the class character of strife revealing clearly the social edges, political positions and ideological confrontation of classes engaged in grim struggle. And that in spite of the fact that the proletarian revolution in Russia emerged victorious in the country on the middle level of socio-economic development where the working class did not constitute the majority of population and were not yet fully "boiled" in the factory boiler, having ties of blood with millions of the peasant masses. In other words, the proletarian revolution emerged victorious in the petty-bourgeois peasant country.

Overthrow of the provisional bourgeois government on October 25, 1917 was the most bloodless revolution. There were a few of the killed and the wounded and raped women-defenders of the Winter Palace, the residence of the government which no one wanted to defend.

Power was quickly handed over to the Soviets of Worker, Peasant and Soldier Deputies. There were only little battles in Moscow. 39 bourgeois and 7 aristocratic landlord parties left the political arena. Petty-bourgeois democrats in the capacity of the Mensheviks and the socialist-revolutionaries were enlisted in Soviet construction and the first revolutionary government headed by Lenin and led by Bolsheviks was set up. The first difficult steps were taken to build a worker-peasant state. All was started anew and it was difficult to predict all.

In his works till the spring of 1918 Lenin formulated the basic tasks on the way to socialist construction, namely, the peaceful way of the proletarian revolution. They included not only the method of competition with bourgeoisie but also the use of bourgeoisie under the control of the worker-peasant state. However, these plans were not to be effected. The classes overthrown by revolution did not accept compromise with the new power. They regarded the revolution of Bolsheviks as seizure of power by deception, as an action having no future. Convinced in their absolute superiority over the worker-peasant state, bourgeoisie and landlords unleashed a civil war and foreign intervention with the assistance of international capital. Struggle between labour and capital assumed the armed form, and war fronts upturned three-fourths of the territory of the country.

When the bourgeoisie failed to overthrow the Soviet power with the help of the armed intervention of Entente and the White Army,

they went over to the tactics of "small wars" in which they strove to destroy the militant union of workers and peasants by means of anti-Soviet mutiny and revolt. In 1920 flames of war spread over Don, Siberia, Altai, Ukraine, Tambov and Kuban regions. The peak of "small wars" was the Kronstadt mutiny in March 1921, after which they receded to an ebb, but their recurrence took place on the perimeter of the country till the '30s. Tens of thousands of bandits penetrated into the territory of the USSR across the frontier of Finland, Poland, Afghanistan and Manchuria. Bloodshed took place on all the borders of the country. The whole party organizations there were destroyed and villages and settlements were burned, causing hundreds of thousands of new orphans and widows.

In 1921 the policy of the "War Communism" caused by civil war was replaced by the New Economic Policy (NEP), which cut away the anti-Soviet roots of the "small wars". Their initiators receded behind the cordon, across which they committed raids. The NEP transferred the indicator of class struggle to the rail of economic competition. The bourgeoisie received the economic freedom of business activity but did not abandon the hope for the restoration of capitalism, replacing the tactics of "small wars" with the tactics of "quiet counterrevolution". They strove to restore the bourgeois ideology by their mass media. The bourgeois intellectuals sabotaged the reconstruction plans of the Soviet power and sabotage, wrecking, professors' strikes took place widely. Oil wells and grain storages were burned, trains derailed, coal mines were waterlogged and factory conveyors were stopped. All these happened. All these caused sorrow and suffering to the people and nursed hatred against the class enemy.

At first the sphere of activity of the "quiet counterrevolution" was the state apparatus and economic organizations. Then the "quiet counterrevolution" wormed its way into the party and army where discontent with the party leadership was fostered and fanned by all means. This was the leadership of Stalin who pledged before Lenin's grave to keep the unity of the party, strengthen the dictatorship of proletariat, the union of the workers and peasants, the union of republics and the Red Army and to be faithful to the principles of the Comintern. He not only pledged but did all to bring his pledge into effect.

Why was Stalin at the helm of the party and the state after Lenin? Anti-communists attributed this to intrigue and craftiness of the Georgian, the ability to remove rivals in the way and so on. This does not correspond with facts. In the beginning of 1924 in the Bolshevik party there was created such a situation in which only one leader openly declared that he steadily would take Lenin's path. Trotsky disputed against Lenin ostensibly, pretending to his leading role in the victory of revolution and the civil war, and his company placed his name before Lenin's name. Bukharin theorized confused-

ly and temporised, elaborating his vivid but not profound writings. Although Zinoviev and Kamenev advertised themselves as "Lenin's friends" of exile days, their double-dealing role on the eve of the armed uprising in the October of 1917 is remembered within the party. None of them said that he was prepared to follow steadily Lenin's path. None, except J.V. Stalin in whom the party and the working class placed faith. Their support conditioned victory over the Right and "Left" opportunism.

Dramatic struggle for socialism in society and liquidation of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements was literally reflected in the inter-party struggle against Trotskyites, Zinovievites and Bukharinites and other opportunists. This was the most complicated stage full of conflicts which determined the success of industrialization, cooperation of agriculture and socialist cultural revolution. Struggle with opportunism became particularly dangerous when in Germany Hitler acceded to power and it became evident that it was impossible to avoid war. Particularly inter-party struggle became complicated after the murder of S.M. Kirov. Khrushchev and anti-communists accused Stalin of this, but, although causes were not ultimately cleared, it recently had to be admitted that Stalin had nothing to do with it.

Later the then US ambassador in the Soviet Union Davis, American jurist who attended all trials in 1937, said that there began liquidation of the "fifth rank" in the rear on the eve of the inevitable war. Liquidation involved considerable number of people and might have been accompanied with violations of socialist legality. Since this is the central point of anti-communist propaganda, let me dwell on it. On January 27, 1991 the plenary meeting of the Political Executive Committee of our All-Union Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals" adopted a declaration "On the attitude to the campaign for rehabilitation of those condemned for the crime against the state in the '20s, '30s, '40s and '50s".

It read in part that the noisy campaign for the rehabilitation of the "victims to Stalin's repression" is one of the key tricks of Gorbachev's perestroika. Demagogy of the campaigners can serve as the historic yard for social hypocrisy and Judas deception. In fact, the inexorable class struggle on the principle "who will beat whom?" which caused loss to the both struggling sides, is presented to philistines as utter tyranny and terrorism caused by the "Reds" in power. Facts of condemnation for the crime against the state which were taken out of the historical context, are considered through the prism of a different time. Instead of consideration in the dialectic unity of the political class struggle and capital crimes committed in this course attention is aroused and only individual biographical stories which are not knit with the logic of this political struggle are taken to draw tears of the present philistines and instigate people to take a negative attitude to the revolutionary past.

At such approach Trotskyites, Zinovievites and Bukharinites are presented as innocent sheep tormented by wolves. This downright lie needs not special refutation, for it was already refuted by thousands of documents and witnesses of those complicated times. The ABCP CC is flooded with hundreds after hundreds of letters from many people who directly suffered terrorism at the hand of the White Guards, kulaks, Basmach men, and nationalists. As lackeys of these enemies then served careerists, trimmers, bureaucrats, schemers, cowardly sycophants and renegades—villains of all hues who later became the backbone of stagnation, Gorbachev's perestroika and post-Gorbachev's period of restoration. For example, the former generals of the State Security Commission Kalugin and Sterling now continue the affairs of betrayers of the '20s-'40s, ranked by Gorbachev and his company as the official political saints, "fighters with Stalinism".

One woman from Siberia wrote to me that her father was thrown into prison by the police head who was later found out to be a former officer of General Kolchak's White Army. A week ago we received a letter from a party veteran in Nizhni Novgorod. He wrote about the widespread practice at the turn of the '30s, which was called "voluntary disownment of the kulak". Its essence lies in that rich farmers, not lodging complaint to the Soviet power and hating kolkhozy, sold their economy of their own accord and left for cities though none touched and persecuted them. Such were hundreds of thousands.

Then significance was not attached to this phenomenon, but now all of them are counted as the eliminated as the kulaks, although they were not. In the years of Five-Year Plans and development of kolkhozy they and their children went to work in factories, collieries and mines and showed particular activeness, trying by all means to worm their way into power and the party, the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs and science. They gained much for themselves, bitterly hating the Soviet regime. Great change took place, the class forces were aligned in favour of the children of the "former".

Such one is Lieutenant General Dmitri Volkogonov, former deputy head of the General Political Bureau of the Red Army, now Yeltsin's leading adviser on military affairs, who is so far seeking the grave of his father who was ostensibly eliminated as the kulak.

How much did this "general in charge of propaganda" lie in enquete, who is zealously "exposing" Lenin, Stalin, socialism and communism in his premature booklets? He does not hesitate to declare that he was "Stalinist" at first, then Leninist and still later suddenly "matured" and came to call himself anti-communist and victim to the elimination of the kulaks. Stalin's grandson Evgeni Dzhugashvili, colonel and instructor of military academy, told me how professor Volkogonov ingratiated himself with him, conducting aspirant's examination in Marxism-Leninism and set an excellent

mark for him without being interested in his knowledge.

The writer of the letter from Nizhni Novgorod adduced an example of his neighbour, pensioner-colonel, whose father voluntarily disowned himself as the kulak, and who was sent to the organs of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs, where he went up from a soldier to the head of a department.

This former "Cheka man" who was delivered by perestroika now curses Lenin, Stalin, the Soviet power and demands disorganization of collective and state farms. Such "Cheka men" gave impetus to the fly-wheel of repression, ready to search "spies and saboteurs" in each brigade of the kolkhozy to get promoted, advertizing their services in exposing the "enemies". How many misinformation was conveyed by these turncoats to the leadership of the country? It was class revenge on the Soviet people of the "former", and is now given out as the terrorism of communists. How many of these "avengers" were repressed after the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU in 1939 when party organizations came to look deep into such activity? The former commissars of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs, Yagoda and Ezhov had to strictly answer for these affairs and were shot to death.

Because of these turncoats and scoundrels thousands of people devoted to the ideals of socialism and the Soviet power lost freedom and even their lives. But they by no means were only victims to tyranny but honest fighters who died because of the machinations of the class enemy who took advantage of the imperfection of the then legislation, legal procedure, technical equipment of enquiry, the inexorability of class struggle. Today Yeltsin and his company rehabilitate the devoted fighters for socialism in the same campaign together with the White Guards and fascist hangmen with whom they once fought a life-and-death battle. Such overall rehabilitation, so-called "zero variety" is aimed to gloss over the fact of the class struggle in the past itself, compromise the idea of defence of class interests of the working people today, revive the thrown away revisionist and capitulationist "theories" which are now designed to serve the oncoming counterrevolution. It only remains to place Hitler on the pedestal of the "victim to Stalin's repression".

The ABCP advocates the unreserved and immediate rehabilitation of the good names of those who stoutly fought for the cause of socialism and laid down their lives in this struggle, falling victim to intrigues and machinations, but we definitely oppose rehabilitation of those who plotted against their people and went over to the side of enemy, wreckers and murderers, spies and saboteurs. There cannot be mercy for them. One sage said, "If one praises betrayal, misfortune is in store for one."

The repressed who served their term in prison often write to us. They refute the allegation of the pseudo democratic newspapers which held that there were only honest people in the concentration

camps. One of the repressed wrote that in one of the big concentration camps where he was confined there was no one innocent prisoner. The prisoners were the worst enemies of the Soviet state who continued their subversive activity even in the camp. He, too, was confined there, the writer of the letter declared, for the affair. Recently there came to our newspaper company one of the "victims to Stalin's repression" who said that he, too, was rehabilitated and given privileges as the sufferer from the Soviet power although in those days he was sent to prison for the murder of his own wife but not for any political offence or crime against the state.... Evidently in this way the present rulers are strengthening the social basis of rehabilitation.

The "quiet counterrevolution" which relied on the opportunist elements within the CPSU in the '30s again suffered defeat.

International capital again counted on the armed struggle with the only socialist country in its envelopment. Now all the diplomatic activity of the Western countries was directed to bringing Hitler to the frontier of the Soviet Union and egging him on to aggression. Under the fascist boots cracked the frontiers of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and then Belgium, Holand, Denmark, Norway, France and Yugoslavia. On the eve of the Second World War with conclusion of Nonaggression Pact with Germany the wise diplomacy of Stalin and Molotov deferred Hitler's attack on the USSR by one and a half year. Not all in Europe rightly understood this step, accusing Stalin of collusion with Hitler.

The Soviet Union made intensive preparations for the repulsion of aggression. Diplomats pushed back the borders from which attack on our country was to be started. These borders were pushed back by 200-300 kilometres westward from Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Odessa. In the end the terrible blows of the aggressor struck us on June 22, 1941 hundreds of kilometres west of the former frontier where the first battles unsuccessful for the Red Army were fought. Whatever their evaluation may be, in their course the first two weeks were won out of 6-8 weeks given by Wehrmacht in "Barbarossa" plan of blitz war with the USSR. These two weeks enabled us to gather strength and prepare for the battles on the Luga region in front of Leningrad, in the vicinity of Smolensk, Kiev, Odessa, Murmansk, taking off from the invaders still 4-5 weeks of summer time valuable for them. If we had not won the time, we had failed to frustrate the blitz war nor could have compelled Hitlerites to wage a war in the condition of winter to which they were not prepared.

The so-called "Molotov-Ribbentrop pact" which is now subjected to unfair attack from all directions helped us win our future allies of anti-Hitler alliance that were not prepared for it till 1939. Owing to this pact the united anti-Soviet alliance of world imperialism was not formed, although Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union was supported by the armies of Italy, Romania, Hungary, Finland and Spain.

Because of the pact militarist Japan did not decide to start war with the Soviet Union, which enabled us to avoid wars at two fronts that might have been fatal to our country.

Exaggeration of the personality of Stalin and his comrades-in-arms in the pre-war and war periods now requires that the result of anti-Stalin campaign should be analyzed without prejudices since its consequences became fatal not only to the Soviet Union but also to all the international working-class and communist movement. Stalin will forever remain in the memory of the grateful posterity as the Supreme Commander of the armed forces who made a decisive contribution to the defeat of the pretenders to world domination. They not only delivered the Soviet people but also all the mankind from the Hitlerite genocide. Many people were to be burned down in the infernal ovens of O'swiecim and Maidanek. The tactics of the "quiet counterrevolution" was applied again and went through the phases of "cold war" and detente. Whatever anti-communists may say now, the Soviet Union, having created its own missile-nuclear arms at the expense of lagging in the growth of well-being of its citizens, made it impossible to trigger off the third world war. The role of Stalin in this problem is colossal.

Although numberless trials befell the Soviet Union in those days, the sentiment of millions of the Soviet people corresponded with the social optimism based on the confidence in the future. The CPSU and the party and state leadership headed by J.V. Stalin enjoyed particularly high authority among the people. Bravery and valour displayed in the battles with the enemy, awareness of social obligation, firm will and indomitable spirit to overcome difficulties, creativity and devotion, readiness to take a risk and take responsibility upon oneself—such are the main qualities of the Soviet people acquired in the new era. The qualities which stood trials in the years of war and five-year plans.

In addition, it is necessary to take into account the fact that the Second World War caused the Soviet Union countless material and irretrievable human loss. On the battlefield remained the flowers of the CPSU, three millions out of five million communists, the most active and self-sacrificing part of the builders and defenders of socialism. War compelled the Soviet state to defer considerably the fulfilment of pressing tasks for developing socialism and improving the people's living standards.

However, after winning victory over the enemy, socialism found in itself the strength, in the first postwar decade, to restore the national economy ruined in the war, made substantial achievement in the development of industrial production, did not allow itself to lag behind advanced capitalist countries in the scientific-technical progress, and sent man into space and created a series of industries for the peaceful use of atomic energy. In the '50s the country ranked first in Europe and second in the world in industrial production,

third in the world in labour productivity in industry. This progress from wooden plow to atomic equipment promoted the Soviet Union to the rank of world superpowers. People abroad began to speak about the "Russian miracle". Immeasurably rose the authority of Stalin to whom the historic successes of the great power was credited with full grounds.

Moreover, toward the '50s in the Soviet Union began to be piled problems mainly in the sphere of planning and management of the national economy. Let me touch on some of them.

First, the growth of production greatly complicated planning on the scale of the whole country. In the period of first five-year plans attended with a great shortage the so-called "gross" quantity indices sufficed, but with the colossal growth of nomenclature of products the quality of products was brought to the foreground. Expansion of the State Planning Committee failed to secure optimal planning. Only recent decades of computerization of state planning made it possible to make simultaneous consideration of quality and quantity indices. In '50s it was impossible.

Secondly, in carrying out the first five-year plans a minister, having under him tens of factories, could directly or through his deputies control introduction of new techniques, growth of labour productivity and other indices of development of production, but in the years of postwar five-year plans he had under him already hundreds or thousands of enterprises the operation of which it became difficult for him to manage from the capital. Therefore, guidance to and control of them weakened. Even Stalin as head of the government had already to put his signature not to decisions and directives but only to the files with the list of such documents.

Thirdly, in the condition of scientific-technical progress it was required to perfect the receptivity of enterprises toward the latest scientific-technical achievements. Then receptivity of the scientific-technical revolution evidently was insufficient. So-called expenditure mechanism formed, under which the growth of demand for increased production of products was met by building additional factories and shops but not by the technical reequipment of existing ones. Toward the '80s the unnecessary mechanism increased, becoming one of the basic brakes to the progress of production.

Fourthly, there arose a pressing question of actual conditions of the political economy of socialism whose theory did not correspond to the realities of existence. It was required to perfect the system of man's interest in labour, namely, material interest, which evidently rested on commodity-money relations as well. Do they work under socialism? This is a problem disputed long among Marxists. At first all market relations were denied by Marxism, as if they ought to be replaced by exchange of products. The question was when to introduce it, right after the seizure of power by the working class, or in step with transition to communism. The new economic policy introduced in the beginning of 1921 altered these views on the commodity-money relations. But in the first year of the NEP a reversion to capitalist market and private property took place and the NEP bourgeoisie revealed interest in the restoration of capitalism. The second year of the NEP obliged one to think over whether the capitalist market is needed to the country going over to socialism. I stress the capitalist market where not only food and consumer goods for producers but also the means of production, land and labour present themselves as commodity.

I think that Lenin had a foreboding of the "basic change of viewpoint on socialism" in this in which Gorbachev and perestroika advocates saw transition to capitalist market, private property over tools and means of production, non-socialist pluralism in ideology and multi-party system in politics.

Stalin gave beginning to the scientific solution of the problems of market in the *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* in 1952, in which he maintained that commodity production will not lead to capitalism if exchange of commodities through purchase and sale is made only for consumer goods. Their production and exchange are subjected to the law of value under socialism. But in socialist society the means of production and labour are not subjected to the regulating act of the given law directly. This was the official ground for the necessity of the socialist market which ensures distribution in accordance with labour but not with capital.

Restoring capitalism, Gorbachev and Yeltsin revived the capitalist market which needed private property, exploitation, unemployment, impoverishment of the working people, subordination of the country to the International Monetary Fund.

Soon after J.V. Stalin's death his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* was criticized and removed from trade and libraries. The ideas set forth in it did not receive due development. But problems remained. Delay of their solution or their ineffective solution brought the country to crisis and to the surrender of the occupied positions.

In Stalin's lifetime the landmark and the index of the quality of work of enterprises were reduction of the cost of products and growth of labour productivity, whereas in the reforms of Khrushchev and Brezhnev they were replaced by profit. It was possible to reduce the cost of products and then wholesale and retail prices of them only by introducing new techniques and technology, and economizing raw and other materials, energy and labour, and on the other hand with profit taken as the basic index of work of socialist enterprises it became possible to manipulate by raising prices on the same products so as to ensure the planned profit.

As a result of reforms of Khrushchev and Brezhnev the economy came to be oriented not toward the reduction of cost and the increase of production of high-quality commodity for fuller supply of the

needs of the working people but toward obtaining profit at any cost. Such orientation led to retardation of national economic development, decrease of the return of fund, gradual devaluation of rouble. Every-year reduction of prices of consumer goods and food stopped and their prices began to rise with gradual vanishment of cheap assortment. Then occurred retardation of scientific-technical progress and fall in the growth of labour productivity, namely, the principal which determines the result of competition between capitalism and socialism on the arena of history.

Ideological overture of these negative processes became the anti-Stalin campaign launched after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, which was officially described as the "criticism of cult of personality". Objectively this campaign which was not distinguished by state wisdom led to undermining of authority of socialism, serious difficulties in the working-class and communist movement, confrontation of the CPSU with the Communist Party of China and of the Soviet Union with the Chinese People's Republic, activation of opponents of socialism in East Europe. This campaign implied petty-bourgeois degeneration of the CPSU. There began mass replacement of the party and Soviet cadres who were accused of "dogmatism" and "Stalinism" and subjected to persecution and moral terrorism.

Acting in this manner, Khrushchev replaced all the secretaries of district, regional and city committees and the central committees of republics with his people who were often inferior to their predecessors in ability and experience of political work. This soon affected not only the party but also economic activity. Thus, an engineer, specialist in fish processing industry, was promoted to the first secretary of the Sakhalin regional committee of the CPSU. This led not only to the failure in the party work but also in the fish processing industry. It turned out that party leadership essentially differed from the administrative-economic guidance and cannot be replaced with one another. Moreover, the promoted specialists brought pragmatism and lack of principle into the party leadership, which made it fast degenerate and change its landmark. The level of the party continued to lower under the leadership of Brezhnev and Gorbachev. Party mass ceased to be proper party, being converted into some base of party pyramid the top of which more and more was alienated from the masses of communists, occupied with paper work and invention of privileges for themselves. Leading cadres were chosen from their clan on the principle of personal faithfulness. The "party of all people" more and more came to be filled with philistines, careerists, trimmers, unprincipled ballast. All this discredited the CPSU in the eyes of the working people.

From the '60s began the change in the social structure of Soviet society. The early prevailing tendency of obliteration of class distinctions began to be covered with professional-property, socio-cultural differentiation. Difference between the high and low paid, above all between the elite intellectuals and the basic masses of the working people increased. There occurred the "backward" class formation, mainly in connection with the "shady" economy giving rise to private capitalist elements who forced primary accumulation of capital. This capital leading to power immediately assumed criminal or openly Mafia character.

The "shady" shops and laboratories working under the signboard of state-run enterprises caused split in the ranks of the working people and brought the degenerated young people into the orbit of criminal business. Their economies created the base of bribing the responsible persons of the state, paving the way to bribery and corruption, which are now in practice on a colossal scale in Russia. At the same time in production there appeared something like "labour aristocracy" that sat at the presidium table at meetings rather than worked in enterprises, occupied "lucrative" posts of trade unions, received unearned pay, praising the success of unworthy administration. These "activists" in the period of Gorbachev's reorganization became suppliers of "labour deputies" in restorationist anti-Soviet organizations, helped Yeltsin to destroy socialist production and now obtain from the government the record wage exceeding that of the working people by ten times. And that without the increase of production and growth of labour productivity.

After liquidation of machine and tractor stations began the break of the formed links between kolkhozy and state properties, undermining the alliance of the working class and peasantry. Kolkhozy were converted into self-supporting economies not covered by state financing and technical assistance. Differentiation of kolkhozniks took place and in this circumstance there appeared speculative elements capable of having good relations with those in power and becoming rich not at the expense of their labour. As a result of growth of their number kolkhozy were converted into unprofitable enterprises living on donation. Today these people formed the backbone of "plantations", which, according to the assertion of Gorbachev and Yeltsin, ought to feed the country.

But plantations are not developing. Many "farmers" returned land back to collective and state farms. Their conflicts with kolkhozniks are aggravating. In a series of regions restorationists had farmers equipped with arms so that they, arms in hand, defend their holdings from their countrymen-collective farmers.

The political superstructure of society is gradually being degenerated. The working class is gradually being removed from the state politics and, as a result, politics loses social stability, is doomed to vacillating, following "the general line of the party". The prestige of highly placed political leaders is falling. Each of them after Stalin strove to attribute the difficulties in the country to the recent respected predecessors. Of course, this is designed to warm their hands at

the fire of the anti-Stalin campaign.

Brezhnev had the possibility of breaking away from not far sighted policy but did not withstand the pressure of the elite intellectuals who in the mid-'60s opposed "return to Stalinism"in which they saw the obstacle to their endless enrichment. The party and state apparatus began to be filled with potential anti-communists and diluted conciliators like Wadim Medvedev, secretary in charge of ideology of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Here evidently it did not do without the so-called "agents of influence" who were trained by the CIA and other Western secret services and who, according to Kryuchkov, former head of the State Security Commission thrown in the prison "Matroskaya Tishina" (seaman´s calm), were gradually promoted to the first roles in the party and the state. The Soviet people put down Gorbachev, A. N. Yakovlev and many other architects of perestroika for such "agents of influence".

In comparison with Stalin's period toward the beginning of perestroika the state apparatus swelled, gradually losing the quality of the organizer of socialist construction and alienating itself from the working people. The growth of officials outstripped the growth of the number of workers engaged in the material production, particularly in agriculture. The bureaucratic officialdom which became exclusive gradually converted into a closed social stratum the whole groups of which were actively corrupted. With the help of degenerated officials in science many were invested with doctor's degree and the title of professor. Precisely from this stratum came many designers of perestroika like Volski, Silaev, Luzhkov, Khizh and others. In the period of Gorbachev's perestroika many directors of factories, Soviet and party workers became candidates for businessmen. Representatives of science, chancellors of university who began their career in the party and state organs swelled their rank.

Thus, Gidaspov, the former secretary of the Central Committee and secretary of the party committee of the Leningrad region, deceiving the bureau of the regional committee, gave out "democrats" 65 million roubles from the party treasury in August 1991. He now owns a whole firm, drives about in a glistening *Toyota* and leads a businessman's life. We see the same in the Khodirev, former secretary of the regional committee of the CPSU and mayor of Leningrad, who now heads a joint firm with Finns. He built such gorgeous houses for himself that even the former emperor of the whole Russia never dreamed. Examples of such kind can be cited without end. I only named those whom I personally knew and who took part in the attempt to remove me from the party in 1970 for exposition of corruption from the "below".

Thus, already in the beginning of the '60s the proletarian state was transformed into the "all-people" state and opportunists headed by Khrushchev called the CPSU "party of all people". It is no wonder that on the yeast of anti-Stalin hysteria this "people's state" gath-

ered in its ranks future businessmen, entrepreneurs, nationalists, cosmopolitans, architects and designers of restorationist perestroika, even monarchists and neo-fascists.

The socio-economic and political foundation of anti-Stalinism was strengthened by the ideology of opportunism. Immediately after the 20th Congress of the CPSU revisionists set to undermine the basic premises of Marxism-Leninism. Opportunism was rehabilitated partly at first and fully with Gorbachev's perestroika. As turned out later, Khrushchev's report to the congress with criticism about the "personality cult of Stalin" was given out by his supporters in the State Security Commission to the Western press in the form of a leakage of information long before the Soviet people and even the leaders of foreign communist parties came to learn about it. It served as the base and beginning of ideological "perestroika" in the USSR and in the CPSU, which opportunists and careerists in social sciences actively conducted.

Above all under the banner of development and elimination of dogmatism the unity of all components of Marxism-Leninism is undermined and narrow specialization of these components of the scientific proletarian world outlook is stressed. In Soviet social sciences Marxism-Leninism is already not regarded as "a monolith cast from one piece of steel" (V.I. Lenin) serving as the philosophical-sociological, politico-economical foundation of the world-historic mission of the working class and its allies called upon to end all forms of oppression, exploitation, social inequality, violence and war between nations. In the Soviet Union Marxist-Leninist sciences are gradually being converted into the medley of "concepts" and "theories" linked artificially to citations from Marx, Engels and Lenin. These theories often had nothing to do with the scientific proletarian world outlook of Marxism-Leninism. Their countless multitude confused people and engendered critical attitude to them as to all kinds of empty talk and fuss.

The leadership of Gorbachev and Yakovlev in the CPSU took the course of including in social sciences the so-called "world's humanitarian social thoughts" through the theories of Bernstein, Kautsky, Berdyaev, Martov, Trotsky, Bukharin, Dzhilis, Lefebvre, Willy Brandt and his colleagues from the Socialist International, which opened the door to conversion of Marxism-Leninism into petty-bourgeois anti-communist world outlook. The former "Marxists" Khasbulatov, Burbulis, Volkogonov, Alekseyev, Stolyarov and others who were educated in anti-Stalinism at first led Gorbachev's perestroika and then restoration of capitalism and disintegration of the Soviet Union after perestroika. Transition from anti-Stalin hysteria to anti-Lenin campaign and vicious anti-communism was quite normal, which in recent years showed clearly.

The conciliatory attitude to the bourgeois reformation of the Central Committee of the CPSU developed into the direct betrayal

of the working class and communists. The same position is so far held by newspaper *Pravda* which was recently headed by Gorbachevite Frolov and now is headed by G.N. Selezhnev who manned the editorial staff with democrats-anti-communists. They refute not only the key premise of Marxism-Leninism about the proletarian dictatorship but also the objectiveness of classes and the class struggle which were admitted already in the beginning of the last century.

Let me say a few words in connection with the proletarian dictatorship admission of which Lenin called a touchstone that distinguishes the genuine revolutionary character. Lenin considered bringing the admission of the class struggle to the admission of proletarian dictatorship as one of the basic services of Marx and Engels. Stalin firmly held this position. Precisely this part of Marxist-Leninist doctrine was particularly subjected to fierce attack of bourgeois politicians and ideologues and in the end vanished from the programme of a series of communist parties.

Of course, the point is not the term but the substance of the concept. Any state represents the dictatorship of one or other class, the class which has economic power. But the substance of power—namely, whose interests the class state realizes and defends—ought not to be confounded with the form, ways and system of exercise of this power. Thus, fascism represents the terrorist form of bourgeois dictatorship. It emerges when capital is obliged to give up the democratic forms of state power and go over to the regime of direct and rude suppression of the working people.

Proletarian dictatorship, as is known, exercises the state power of the working class and its allies, and can assume different forms of regime of power. The working people are interested in that the mode of exercise of their power was the most democratic. But this, as history shows, not always depends on them. Resistance of bourgeoisie may require more cruel regime of power. Revolution ought to know how to defend itself, otherwise it counts little.

The bourgeois ideologues and opportunists deliberately confound the substance of proletarian dictatorship as the class essence of the proletarian state power with the forms and methods of its exercise. It is done to equalize socialism with fascism and disorient the working people. Social democrats and European communism have taken this path. Some communists do not see tricks here. Recently in *Pravda* one of the leaders of the Indian Communist Party, asserting the necessity of proletarian dictatorship, considered that pure democracy is possible for the developed European countries. But dictatorship ought not be set against democracy as the substance of power. They can be set against one another only as the forms, ways and regimes of exercise of power of one or other class. Herein lies the essence!

The leitmotif of opportunists from the CPSU has become the

preaching of civil peace in the period when counterrevolution attacks socialist gains of the country, prohibits the CPSU and commits bloody crimes in the so-called "hot spots". Recently in Pridnestrovie in Moldavia women, leaving their children and old people behind, took the battle positions to check the Moldavian bourgeois nationalists attempting to annex Moldavia to Romania. By the way, Moldavian nationalists are equipped with Belgium-made tommy guns. It is high time for Europe to understand that arms traders who throw oil on our flames of inter-nationality conflicts shall share responsibility with criminals-nationalists for the blood and tears of innocent people sooner or later.

Our Bolshevik party also suffered loss. Two weeks ago in Pridnestrovie fell in action our comrade, journalist-Bolshevik, Kuban Cossack volunteer Evgeni Berlizov who did much to dispel lie of anti-Stalinism among the Cossacks. In the prison of Vilnius "democrat" Landsbergis' hangmen are beating and torturing our comrade Lithuanian Bolshevik Alexandr Smotkin, one of the editors of newspaper *Lithuanian International Movement* who regularly published our materials for two years. We are now raising money to pay advocates. There are other victims to counter-revolution and martyrs , faithful sons of the working people who defended their interests to the end. We, Soviet communists, consider that the world's people should understand that the development of events in our country tends to reaction and fascism. To check it is the duty of all the honest-minded people.

We considered the premises and roots of anti-Stalinism in economic, political, party and social life which led to the social-democratic degeneration of the CPSU, conduced to the conversion of the party founded by Lenin into political nonexistence, to flourishing state of anti-communism, to the degeneration of nationalist tendencies to wild nationalism and chauvinism, which threw the Soviet people into the mire of unknown disaster and suffering.

Summarizing the mentioned above, I point out that the economic preconditions of anti-Stalinism in the Soviet Union were above all the inability of the leadership of Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Gorbachev to cope with the objective difficulties in the growth of socialist production and introduction of capitalist elements in socialist economy, which made it expendable and ineffective. In social sphere the roots of anti-Stalinism lie in the emergence of the "shady" neo-bourgeoisie, its gradual growth, emergence of the strata among the working people of town and country which lived off their labour, expansion of bureaucratic apparatus of management, alienation of elite intellectuals from the masses of people. In the political sphere the foundation of anti-Stalinism is rooted in the working class being driven out of the leadership over the country, in weakening the worker-peasant state power, in the opportunist degeneration of party leadership. In the sphere of international policy it is the

underestimate of the class substance of peaceful coexistence of different socio-economic systems. In the sphere of ideology the precondition of anti-Stalinism is the inability of the CPSU to develop Marxism-Leninism in the new historical conditions.

The experience of three or four decades of the Soviet history clearly shows that the main enemy of Stalin's leadership–opportunism–inevitably and naturally degenerates into open restoration of capitalism. Anti-Stalin hysteria played the role of screen for stepping up anti-Lenin and anti-communist campaign as a whole and then was employed by counterrevolution to destroy socialism and the powerful united Soviet power. Anti-Stalinism is a Trojan Horse in the international communist movement, which led to the ruin and degeneration of the parties of the former community of socialist countries which blindly copied the line of the CPSU.

More and more Soviet people begin to understand this, read Stalin's works, create societies named after him and publish newspaper *For Motherland, for Stalin.*

In conclusion I would like to point out that Stalin's conclusions which had seemed doubtful at one time are now deemed prophetic. Among them, for example, the proposition on the possibility of aggravation of the class struggle with the progress of the Soviet Union toward socialism. Before it seemed unreal, today's social cataclysms on the territory of the Soviet Union actually confirm Stalin's conclusion. Or Stalin's anticipation that Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations will be maintained for no more than 50 years. Restoration of capitalism in a number of East European socialist countries, tendency to revision of postwar frontier testify to the farsightedness of Stalin's foresight. Next, the feasibility of Stalin's foresight when he asserted that after his death generations of Bolsheviks would be accused of many things which were not their fault. So it happened. But, Stalin said, the wind of history will inevitably sweep away the leaves of slander from our graves and reveal the truth.

The ABCP will not spare pains so that this wind of history would blow as early as possible which would not only sweep away lies, hypocrisy, and betrayal caused by the restoration of capitalism but also show the whole world who is who at the present sharp turning-point of world history of the 20th century. I think we will be joined in this by many of those to whom peace and socialism are dear, those who stood and stand for the truth of history and the just cause of the working people who defend now in the Soviet Union their glorious revolutionary past and the genuinely humanitarian communist future to which all the roads of world civilization will inevitably lead so that communists will go ahead together along this world-historic path. The ABCP considers that the time to revive Comintern has come. By bringing up this question for debate I would like to conclude my speech.

Thank you!

* * *

SPEECH AT THE MEETING HELD IN LENINGRAD ON MAY 9, 1992

Dear comrades and friends,
Valiant veterans of the Great Patriotic War,
Heroic Leningrad citizens who stood a siege,
Working people who worked devotedly in the Soviet rear,
Citizens and guests of our great city on the river Neva,

Allow me on behalf of the ABCP to congratulate you on the 47th anniversary of the Great Victory, the victory the flag of which is permeated with the blood of victors in the war against fascism and military and labour feats. The feats are immune to time. The glory of veterans will be immortal! The farther the victorious May of 1945 recedes, the brighter the historic feats not forgotten by nations will shine.

During recent several months the secretaries of the CC of the ABCP held talks with the leaders and delegations of the communist parties of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America at Athens, Pyongyang, Brussels and Moscow. At the talks the present-day situation in the USSR and the state of international communist and working-class movement were discussed. The meaning of these comradely talks boils down to the following four problems.

First, the present restoration of capitalism in the USSR is a leading factor of international significance as October 1917 was in its time. So, the struggle against this restoration assumes an international character with the participation of all the progressive forces of the world which begin to be relieved from the shock by Gorbachev's perestroika.

Secondly, the temporary setback of socialism in the USSR and Europe places the problem of re-founding of Communist International on the agenda, which will promote the unity of anti-imperialist forces at the present stage and help to clear the Augean stables of opportunism and treachery in the international communist and working-class movement.

Thirdly, foreign communist parties began to understand that it is impossible to go a long way on the overdriven jade of anti-Stalin hysteria, to win a victory over capital, to build socialism, to put an end to bourgeois restoration.

Fourthly, at the present stage all communist parties and progressive movements must extend their support to the Asian countries and Cuba which are building socialism, for all the subversive activities of imperialism are aimed at them. The fate of our country is closely connected with the successes in these socialist countries.

The frank exchange of opinions with fraternal parties showed that hundreds of millions of people sympathize with us and support our struggle against treacherous cliques which usurped power. The collapse of the USSR and its colonialization by internal and external reaction did not save the "civilized" West from worsening crisis, perilous growth of unemployment, social tension, outbreak of national and racial enmity within their countries. The danger of outbreak of World War III is increasing, which may start in our territory.

Leonid Kravchuk, Yeltsin's accomplice in treachery in the Belobez wood, asked generals of combined units stationed in Ukraine whether they will fight Russia. He, a contemptible party bureaucrat and excommunicated priest who defected from the CPSU, is impatient to become yet a war criminal. He seems to have forgotten what this ended in for Goering, Ribbentrop, Keitel and other Hitler's associates whom our great victory hanged on the gallows. Let Kravchuk and his like not forget that our country has ropes enough to hang war criminals in spite of a great dearth of things.

Unfortunately, I have to speak an unpleasant thing about the high ranking officers of the armed forces on the occasion of the anniversary of the Great Victory. The impression is produced on the people that some generals and admirals consider it possible to forget whom they made oath before and therefore serve not the Soviet people but venal cliques of timeservers before whom they stand on their knees humbly. Can one be indifferent to this? It is an insult to the veterans to put up the generals and marshals of 1945 for an example to pro-Gorbachev generals in trousers with red stripes. It is unconstitutional to call upon their subordinates to disobey their orders.

The ABCP proposes that a special public institution to evaluate the patriotic profile of military leaders be set up on the basis of the Unions of Officers, the War Veterans' Council, the "Working Russia", the Patriotic Movements, "Unity" society and other public organizations. This institution may be called the People's Attestation Commission or the Tribunal of the Working People. It should be invested with the right, on behalf of the people, to warn or demote those who said "I serve the USSR" merely for convenience' sake for many years. You will say that Yeltsin and Kravchuk clique will not demobilize the demoted. I agree with you. Probably they may be paid higher salary. But in this case the demoted will no longer serve the people on behalf of whom they received high military ranks, but ordinary hirelings, members of a punitive expedition, landsknechts of venal clique. They will not be cleared of disgrace to the end of their life.

I think that these acts must be made public. The examinees and their advocates ought to be invited to be present and the result be published in the press. The time seems to have come for Marshal Shaposhnikov, Colonel General Volkogonov, Stolyarov, a general newly-appointed by Yeltsin and a number of other turncoats to have principled talks with Soviet patriots. The matter depends on you—

comrades officers, veterans and patriots. The ABCP considers that the Unions of Officers must play the role of organizer of this patriotic clearing mission.

We welcome the soldiers faithful to their oath who continue to serve the USSR in our grim days, those who oppose the criminal acts of splitting the Armed Forces and those who stand guard over the Soviet border. At the same time we congratulate the officers, generals and admirals who were dismissed from their posts by bourgeois counterrevolution. I am convinced that many of them will come to serve our fatherland and recover the fighting efficiency of units and combined units and the might of the Great Power.

Glory to the Soviet people who had hoisted the Flag of Victory over the Reichstag!

Let us remain faithful to this victorious banner to the end!

Long live the unity of the army and the people!

Let us strengthen the united anti-restoration front of the working people!

I congratulate you, dear compatriots, on the great Day of Victory!

Unity No. 9 (38), May 1992

* * *

SOME LESSONS OF TEMPORARY DEFEAT OF SOCIALISM IN THE USSR AND INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Speech Delivered in Germany in June 1992

Thousands of comrades from capitalist and developing countries ask us, Soviet communists, questions: Why do not the working people of our country revolt against restoration of capitalism, mass impoverishment and unemployment? What are 19 millions of party members of the CPSU doing in these tragic conditions? What has become of hundreds of thousands of party workers, activists, lecturers and teachers of Marxism-Leninism? Why does no one resist the ban of the CPSU and robbery of the property and finances of the party? Questions are not simple. They will, no doubt, become for decades the subject of discussion of historians, sociologists and philosophers. Today it is urgently necessary for the Soviet communists to give reply, even preliminary, to them, which is utterly needed for the international working-class and communist movement.

Above all, I dwell on the characteristics of the situation of the CPSU as the party which led socialist construction in the USSR. Lesson of experience of unprecedented rise and fall of its authority has no historical analogue. Analysis of this experience and drawing lessons from this for the future are a really international task on the

successful fulfillment of which the global process of liberation of mankind from exploitation and oppression and the victory of communism depend. The attempts to falsify this world-historic experience on the part of ideological centres of imperialism and also of revisionists-reformists and opportunists-restorationists of capitalism in our days exceeded all preceding propaganda campaigns of anti-communism in their scale.

It is not taken into account abroad that the two-three generations of the Soviet people are not personally associated with capitalist orders and their carriers and have no idea of what unemployment, power of capital over labour and lack of confidence in tomorrow and the future of their children are like. In the period of stabilization of capitalist system people in the Soviet Union often judged bourgeois countries by the rich show-windows of supermarkets, the latest make of smart automobiles, relatively high living standards of the basic masses of the working people in the developed capitalist countries without consideration of their constant struggle with capital for their social gains and plunder of the "third-world" countries and the like.

The seventy year long experience of life under the Soviet power made the working people believe that difficulties, deficiency and distortions in politics and the economy will be overcome sooner or later under the leadership of the Soviet power. They practically were not required to do some warning of the character of initiative. Rather on the contrary, excess of personal initiative may disagree with the changes in society and bring harm to them and the cause of socialism. The blind and often uncritical trust in the "leaders" of the CPSU kept back and made it difficult for many people to make genuine appraisal of the bourgeois-restorationist perestroika with initiative which the Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze clique came forth with, having acceded to the leadership of the party in 1985.

Further, for the Soviet man the concept of class struggle itself converted into some abstract symbol inherited from the distant revolutionary epoch. Although class struggle in the country actually did not cease, only changing its form, it was rarely mentioned. Decades of such political education of the working people could not but tell on the social consciousness and psychology of the masses of people, on the loss of class intuition and vigilance to the scheming of the forces hostile to socialism at home and abroad. Here imperialist propaganda and its increasing professionalization in fooling the Soviet people should not be ignored.

The ruling character of the CPSU and its indisputable services to the people for recent three-four decades came to engender conceit and complacence. This could not but to be reflected on its composition. In the years of the Second World War each communist had to prove his or her dedication to socialism by rising up under enemy fire and in the years of Stalin's five-year plans by constant readiness

to work where the party sends him or her. Later the essence of demand to communist shifted to conscientious attitude to work, other moral qualities conditioned by "material interest". This in practice opened the valve of replenishment of the CPSU with careerists and sycophants, the people for whom affected party loyalty and activeness were the sole and easy means for personal advancement. Those unsound in professional relations often wormed their way into party organs. All this could not but tell on the authority of the CPSU among the people.

The affair of promotion and education of leading party cadres was in worse situation. One of the basic organizational principles—incompatibility with the membership of the CPSU of selection of cadres on the principle of personal faithfulness but not on the principle of political and practical qualifications—was soon deleted from the rules adopted at the 19th Congress of the party. Change of party leadership in the centre inevitably brought about change of leading cadres in the provinces, and that often with less suitable ones. After the 20th Congress "pragmatists", administrators, former specialists of national economy who were incapable of political judgement of situation wormed their way into the leadership of the territorial, regional and city committees of the CPSU. They brought into the leading party environment lack of principle and readiness for "perestroika" and change of "landmarks". This told on the tempo of socialist construction, the level of leadership and responsibility for the entrusted affair and opened the way for degeneration, lordliness, bureaucratism and communist superciliousness.

Among people the image of party workers came to be connected with the hats made with young reindeer skin on their heads which could be obtained from the supply stores closed to the public. Party work gradually lost ideo-political character, converting into a sort of bureaucratical activity. In some republics party bureaucrats gained the reputation of new khans and rulers standing above people, their needs and requirements. Even the party staff members of the lowest level (to say nothing of the leading party bureaucrats) ceased to associate with the working people and rank and file communists, preferring meeting on the spot with administrators and other chiefs. Objective examination of practical qualifications on the spot gradually discontinued, internal contradictions in party collectives were smoothed over and cadres for promotion to party apparatus were chosen among those who preferred going to regional and city party committees for "advice", demonstrating their obedience and skill to guess the opinion of the party leadership.

Beginning with the '60s in the leadership of the CPSU there was observed gradual deviation from Lenin's style in party and state work. The essence of this style of Leninism, in the words of J.V. Stalin, was "combination of Russian revolutionary sweep with American business ability". Russian revolutionary sweep means

"vigor which jogs thought, pushes ahead, breaks away with the past and offers prospect." American business ability means "the ability which does not know nor recognize obstacle, overcomes all kinds of hindrance with business-like insistence and completes the started affair to the end." The Lenin's style of party work most fully manifested itself in the Stalin's five-year plans, in victory over Hitler and rehabilitation of the economy ravaged in the war.

Russian revolutionary sweep was gradually superseded by the "revolutionary" writing, bureaucratic framing of plans which derived from the faith in the force of decrees and directives as if they themselves could do and change everything. Lenin called this "revolutionary" verbosity and political empty talk. American business ability in party and state work began to be converted into narrow unprincipled utilitarian approach, wingless practicism of pragmatists. Especially "socialist" red-tapism and "brainless utilitarian approach" (Lenin) widely spread in the years of Brezhnev's stagnation and Gorbachev's perestroika, which seriously impaired the authority of the party leadership.

Bureaucratic degeneration of party apparatus increased with it that in the CPSU was gradually blunted such sharp weapon as criticism and self-criticism which is the powerful means of exposition and remedy of shortcomings and an important way of influence of people on the course of social life. Precisely criticism and self-criticism awaken in the working people the sentiment of the master of the country, increase their political and labour activeness and make them take part in the management of social affairs. Conceit, complacency, Manilov-like nonchalance, passion for celebration, "dosing" of criticism at congresses and conferences resulted in that wrong resolutions were retained, the viability of wrong directive increased and all illnesses of the party organism became chronic and worse.

Reprisals for criticism acquired mass character. It became impossible to fight for elementary justice. Bureaucrats made reprisals on those who dared to file a complaint against them, declaring that "the time of Red commissars is gone". The party ceased to strengthen itself, criticizing itself, which inevitably led to its ruin. Taking advantage of this, anti-communists introduced the idea of "biparty system". Philistines saw its embodiment in the "duet of Gorbachev-Yeltsin", as if it gave possibility for "leaders" to take turns in leadership. Finally the idea of "biparty system" developed into assertion on the necessity of political pluralism of anti-socialist character.

Thus the CPSU shared the fate of the Second International, which was also ruined by the fear of self-criticism and the attempt to veil sore problems of inner-party life. Experience once again confirmed the correctness of the repeated warning of Lenin and Stalin.

The disruption of the CPSU was also spurred by gap between theory and practice. Outwardly all was right with theory. Under the

leadership of the Central Committee of the CPSU functioned the Academy of Social Sciences director of which was in the rank of department head of the Central Committee of the party, worked institutions of philosophy, economy, history, sociology and thousands of chairs of social sciences where great proportion of scientific potential of the country was concentrated. Scholars-social scientists were cadres cared for by the party, that is, chosen, approved and promoted by party organs. Journals, collections and monographs which proclaimed the party and class character of the theory on society were issued. But from the end of the '70s the term "Marxist-Leninist theory" gradually disappeared from publications and were replaced by more "neutral" term, social science, society lore and the like.

Deviation of theory from socio-political practice was preceded by split of unique revolutionary theory, division of Marxism into component parts and disciplines. Philosophy, sociology, political economy, scientific socialism, ethics, esthetics, atheism, social psychology and other "independent" disciplines developed in diverging direction, often losing connection with the problems of direct socialist construction. But this was not the main thing. The main thing, in our opinion, was that Marxism-Leninism ceased to be considered as the theoretical foundation of the world-historic mission of the working class–to create society free from exploitation, oppression, violence, wars and social injustice. In other words, the class-party foundation of scientific proletarian world outlook which was Marxism-Leninism historically and was actually gradually washed away.

At the same time gradually blunted was the revolutionary edge of the Marxist-Leninist theory, which ceased to be considered as the "experience of the working-class movement of all countries taken as a whole" (Stalin). The political theory of Marxism came to be reduced to scientific socialism and accordingly the CPSU was declared to be the party of scientific socialism. The next step on this path was qualification of the CPSU as the "party of all people". This conclusion was included in the basic documents at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU precisely when the so-called "shady economy" legalized by Gorbachev's perestroika came to gain strength. Opportunism gradually received its political formulation in the party. It came to be implanted in the consciousness of communists and the working people through mass media, party propaganda and enlightenment, the system of secondary and higher education. The basic premises of Marxism-Leninism were gradually ousted from the theory of social development. Theory became aimless and the practice of socialist construction, blind, confused, winding or spontaneous. The socio-economic practice ceased to be the basis of theory and criterion of its truthfulness. Such masterpieces like the slogan "Economy must be economical" were circulated.

At the same time with the conversion of the CPSU from the

working-class party into the "party of all people" the Soviet state as the working-class state was converted into the "all-people state". In this state the "Soviet" millionaires grew like mushrooms after rain, bureaucracy prospered and bribery and corruption bred. Towards the '80s the state apparatus increased three times in comparison with the Stalin's period. Effectiveness of its operation decreased. Gradual alienation and estrangement from the working people took place. This undermined the democratic social basis of the Soviet state, deprived it of the support of the working people and weakened the struggle with crimes which now disrupted the functioning of society.

Through the "all- people state" the consciousness of the masses of people was imbued with the ideas of overall equality and "pure democracy". They covered up and camouflaged the principal impossibility of equality between the exploiters and the exploited and between oppressors and the oppressed. Today not only the working people but also opportunists together with renegades from the editorship of newspaper *Pravda* learned from their own experience that after restoration of capitalism in the USSR actual "freedom" can not be for the exploited if only because offices, publishing house, TV studio, paper stores necessary for the use of "freedom" are in the hands of entrepreneurs and their political hirelings. They now strive to organize information blockade to the Soviet people. The former communist press is now stifled economically and the working people gradually are kept away from newspapers and journals by high prices. But the semi-official press serving restorationists receive government subsidy and are promptly supplied with all that are needed.

Transition to "all-people state" conduced to far-going distortion of Marxist-Leninist theory on the proletarian dictatorship. It is known that in class society any state presents dictatoship of this or that class. It is the class of slave-owners, feudal landlords or capitalists. In this aspect dictatorship presents the substance of power as the state power expressing the interests of economically ruling class in society. In other words, those who decide social problems finally in the interests of this class or classes.

But the concept of "dictatorship" has another meaning reflecting the form, method, regime and mechanism of exercise of power. In this aspect not all states are dictatorial. The regime of state power much depends on the external and internal conditions in which the state functions. In the conditions of growing menace for the power of capital, for example, bourgeois state fairly fast becomes authoritarian and dictatorial the extreme form of which is fascism as the openly terroristic regime of power of big capital.

Bourgeois ideologues and opportunists deliberately confuse the concept of dictatorship as class substance of power with the form and methods of exercise of this power. Incidently they take advantage of the fact that the Soviet state which emerged as a result of

victory of proletarian revolution embodied the mentioned two aspects of dictatorship (the class case), because it met the frantic resistance of domestic and foreign counterrevolution. In this connection Lenin and Stalin defined proletarian dictatorship as" domination of proletariat over bourgeoisie which is unlimited by law and relies on violence and enjoys sympathy and support of the working and exploited masses of people" (Lenin, *State and Revolution*). At the same time it is stressed that proletarian dictatorship presents the widest democracy for the working people as the democracy for the recently exploited majority which is compelled to rigidly restrict the rights of the exploiting minority at the initial stage. With consolidation of the Soviet state these restrictions were gradually removed. Centre of gravity shifted from suppression of exploiters to the educational, administrative and economic work. The state of proletarian dictatorship enacted its laws, securing their observance by all.

Did proletarian dictatorship fulfil their tasks in the USSR?

Now it can be asserted on good grounds that it did not. The point is not only that the heirs of the classes defeated in revolution wormed their way into the leadership of the party and state. The worker-peasant state did not perform the two main tasks concerning the working class themselves. First, the working class as a whole failed to steel and educate itself as the force capable of managing the country. Incidently it ought to be taken into account that it suffered heavy loss in the years of the Second World War. Therefore, after the war it was actually formed anew in the southern and western regions. In the east the working class absorbed considerable number of exiled settlers, former Nepmen and rich peasants who had settled anti-socialist sentiment. Specifically the present support of Yeltsin in Kuznetsk coal-fields can be explained by this.

The possibilities existing under socialism were not used for the political growth of workers. In '70s-'80s the process of depoliticization of different strata of the working people took place, which led to erosion of their class self-consciousness. Strivings to offer society less and take from it more affected fairly wide sections of population including workers. Their lag in educational level impaired their authority as the leading force of socialist transformation.

Secondly, in the USSR there was by far not completed the process of reeducation and remolding of petty-bourgeois strata in town and country in the socialist spirit nor done away with the private-owner tendencies which restorationists now rely on. In the CPSU the significance of such social stratum as technical intellectuals which rapidly grew in the epoch of scientific-technical progress was not fully taken into account. Contradictions between them and the working class were not settled in time. Considerable lag in the rise of salary of intellectuals was tolerated, which was weakly connected with the result of labour of production collectives. Liquidation of machine and tractor stations in the period of Khrushchev's reforms

impaired the union of the working-class with collective farmers, which soon negatively told on the agricultural production. Purchase of grains from abroad began.

Thus it can be concluded that beginning with the end of the '50s the Right opportunist leadership of the CPSU objectively retarded solution of social problems of socialist construction and Gorbachev's perestroika went over to the revival of the social basis of bourgeois counterrevolution. The working class and collective and state-farm farmers were disorganized in face of actions hostile to them of restorationists of capitalism.

It ought to be specially stressed that in the period of long stabilization of world capitalism the leadership of the CPSU failed to avoid basic dangers of party degeneration with which the ruling parties are always menaced.

The first danger is that growth of difficulties in socialist construction and absorption in business routine may cause loss of socialist prospects, which finally develops into liquidationism. The vivid example of that is the practice of Gorbachev's doctrine. The main causes of this danger are connected with lack of faith in the creativity of the working people—the working class, kolkhoznik and the working intellectuals. This path, as Stalin warned, leads to degeneration of the worker-peasant state into the bourgeois-democratic state.

The source of liqudation "mood" here is the increase of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois pressure on the party and is aggravation of struggle between socialist and capitalist elements in the country. It is characteristic that the capitalist elements in the USSR grew as a result of distortion and violation of the laws of socialist construction in the last three decades. They carried struggle into the sphere of ideology in an attempt to infect the unstable part of communists with skeptical attitude to socialist construction and lack of faith in the communist prospect of the country.

If the first danger of party degeneration is connected with the increase of bourgeois influence on the CPSU as to the line of internal policy, the cause of the second, nationalist danger is the increase of influence on the party as to the line of foreign policy and on the line of struggle between the international monopoly capital and the socialist system of states. Opportunists castrated the class substance of the policy of peaceful coexistence, which led to weakening of influence of socialism on the "third world" and undermined the position of the international communist and working-class movement.

Eventually the path of degeneration and nationalism here was the path of gradual weakening of international policy of socialism. Opportunists induced the Soviet people to consider their country not as part of a whole in the world revolutionary process but as the beginning and end of this process. It was considered that the inter-

ests of all other countries and revolutionary parties ought to be sacrificed in the interests of our country. This pseudo socialist nationalism led to the refusal of support of national-liberation forces in other countries and of assistance to brotherly parties and tolerated division of the world into the "spheres of influence" of great powers and deals of these powers between them at the expense of the interests of other nations.

The mentioned principles of foreign policy advocated by opportunism were continued and strengthened by the restorationists of capitalism in the USSR, which trained social consciousness in the spirit of egoism and nationalism at the expense of breaking away from the ealier friendly nations including Slavic ones. Such purpose was pursued by the provocative fuss about the "money of the CPSU" when the brotherly international obligation was passed off as illegal deals, using turncoats from the apparatus of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the State Security Commission.

Only on the basis of consistent internationalism the USSR could maintain the role of the standard-bearer of the world revolutionary movement. On the contrary, nationalist tendencies in foreign policy can lead to isolation and disintegration of the socialist State. The restorationist perestroika proved that nationalism passed off as "patriotism" threw Russia and other "sovereign" states into the embrace of their geopolitical enemies, depriving them of old tested allies in the persons of peoples fighting for peace, democracy and socialism.

The Right opportunist leadership of Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze-Yeltsin proved the reality of mentioned dangers, bringing the USSR to disruption, socialism to capitalization and the CPSU to liquidation. This clique bears direct responsibility for the opportunist degeneration of parties in European socialist countries which our treachery brought to difficult situation. It bears responsibility for the activation of international capital attacking now progressive forces everywhere and for crisis in the world communist and working-class movement. Restoration of capitalism in the USSR in our times is the leading factor of international politics the significance of which goes far beyond the bounds of one country. Therefore the struggle with bourgeois counterrevolution in our country, too, ought to bear international character. The result of the liberation struggle in the whole world much depends on it. In this connection the international communist movement and all the progressive forces the world over should join this struggle. International capital fears international solidarity of the working people and by all means obstructs the formation of the unified front of struggle to which the future belongs historically.

The dramatic events in the USSR testifies to it that the communist parties which followed the opportunist policy of the CPSU in the recent decade are in grave crisis. Part of them, following the so-

called "democratic platform in the CPSU" goes over to the social-democratic and bourgeois-liberal positions, finally breaking away from Marxism-Leninism and leaving the ranks of the world working-class and communist movement. Another part of them is in a state of bewilderment, seeks the "third line" and pretends to "centrism", inheriting the traditions of Gorbachev in this. And finally yet another part of them strengthens the Marxist-Leninist proletarian flank of the working-class and communist movement and reconstructs the parties of Leninist type as the political organizations more fully corresponding to the interests of struggle between labour and capital. The process of demarcation is painful and contradictory but historically necessary.

In the sphere of ideology the process of rebirth, clearance and strengthening in the communist movement requires understanding that with militant anti-Stalinism now one cannot go a long way, nor win victory over the power of capital nor build socialism nor defend social gains of the working people. It now has become clear to many comrades that anti-Stalinism is the most dangerous form of opportunism in the contemporary communist movement which plays the role of the Trojan Horse in it. In this connection the role and authority of the communist parties which opportunists called Stalinist, Maoist or Hoxhaist are rising. In other words, they are the parties which did not accept the opportunist resolutions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU which were duplicated and developed by European communism. Today it is important for these communist or workers' parties to join the general struggle at all fronts of battle with the force of reaction. It is necessary to put an end to mutual accusation of communist parties and disputes as early as possible and achieve wide unification of communists through unity of action in the struggle with the common enemy.

Opportunism set communist or workers' parties at loggerheads and set one party against another even in separate countries. Some of them received monetary subsidy on behalf of the CPSU and yet some of them were cursed. Only imperialism gained by this. It is time to deprive it of winning position here. Today for the struggle against capital not distinction between views of communists on the events of history and modern times but unity of practical-political actions in the struggle with imperialist reaction and opportunism is important. The slogan of our great teachers "Workers of all countries, unite!" acquires now special significance.

The bosses of international capital supposed that disruption of the USSR and socialist countries in Europe will help prevent the coming economic crisis by their colonization and conversion into the sources of raw materials and cheap labour. However, the expectation did not come true. With the aid of gangster-like robbery of "socialist barbarians" the "civilized" West is not saved from its own crisis, increase of the unemployed, social tension and explosion of

national and racial hatred. Placed on the agenda is the fresh aggravation of contradictions within capitalist countries, which are again fraught with the danger of redivision of the world. Now unified front of struggle against restoration emerged and develops in the East Europe as the counterbalance to the expansion of imperialism, which began seriously to worry the "victors in the velvety revolutions". By-product of contradictions which are being aggravated in the world is the growth of anti-American sentiment and emergence of neo-Nazist groups on the political arena and even in Russia.

Temporary defeat of socialism in the USSR and Europe objectively transfers the centre of world revolutionary movement to Asia and Latin America and makes China, DPRK, Vietnam, Cuba and Laos the main bastions of socialism. Special responsibility now rests with the leadership of these ruling parties for proletarian staunchness, scientific substantiation, correctness and flexibility of the pursued policy. Today all the subversive activity of imperialism is precisely aimed at and concentrated on them. Today the slogan "Hands off the socialist countries!" ought to sound decisively and aloud as never before. Our international obligation is to support the countries of socialist orientation. Conferences of communists where concrete arrangements on this problem would be made are needed.

The crisis of world socialism now pressingly requires discussion of the problem of revival of the Communist International as the international class organization of the working people. Preparation for the rebirth of the Communist International itself will promote consolidation of the anti-imperialist and progressive forces, their class-social differentiation and effecting of demarcation with opportunists and class collaborators. Acceptance of Pyongyang Declaration * (April 1992) by revolutionary parties can be considered as the first step on this path, I think. In the world liberation movement there will be apparently found the forces which at the present stage will further the cause of consolidation and unification of communist forces. The experience of the Third International which played its role and ceased its activity during the height of the Second World War can offer essential help here.

However anti-communists may be delighted and rage, the crisis of socialism in our days has temporary character. Capitalism saved this time by traitors-opportunists cannot solve even one problem facing mankind. Collapse of imperialism can only be deferred but is not withdrawn from the agenda. Its present "victory" is fraught with danger of graver crisis, aggravation of all world contradictions and struggle for division of the world. The main thing is that Iraqi, Yugoslavian and other "varieties" of provocation of the third world war which can lead to the self-liquidation of mankind are being performed.

Socialism will clear of opportunist filth, sooner or later tide over the crisis and open up its boundless possibilities of self-perfection.

Objectively this is the only chance to save peoples of the globe from military, economic, ecological, demographic, information and other global crises, for it most fully reflects the interests common to mankind.

Here much will depend on us, communists, on our solidarity and militancy, and capacity to win the hearts of people and draw lessons from committed errors. Today the role of subjective factor in history the action of which is materialized through classes, parties, their leaders and ideologues rises as never before.

The wind of history inevitably will disperse the cloud of reaction. The cause of communism is just! The future belongs to it! Socialism or death! We will emerge victorious!

Pyongyang Declaration "Let Us Defend and Advance Socialist Cause" reads in part:

"The setback of socialism and the revival of capitalism in some countries is causing a great loss to the achievement of socialist cause, but it can never be interpreted as the denial of the superiority of socialism and, of the reactionary character of capitalism.

"Socialism has long been the ideal of mankind and it represents the future of mankind.

"Socialist society is, in essence, a genuine society for the people where the popular masses are the masters of everything and everything serves them.

"But the capitalist society is an unfair one where 'the rich get ever richer and the poor poorer'. In this society money decides everything, exploitation of man by man predominates and a handful of exploiter classes lords it over. It is inevitably accompanied by political non-rights, unemployment, poverty, drugs, crimes and other kinds of all social evils which trample the human dignity underfoot.

"Only socialism can eliminate domination, subjugation and social inequality of all manners and ensure the people substantial freedom, equality, true democracy and human rights....

"Socialism is carved out and built with a country or national state as a unit. The socialist cause in each country should be fulfilled on the responsibility of the party and people of that country.

"Each party should work out lines and policies which tally with the actual situation of the country where it is active and with the demands of its people and implement them by relying on the popular masses.

"It should not abandon its revolutionary principles at any time and under any circumstances but uplift the banner of socialism.

"The socialist cause is a national one and, at the same time, a common cause of mankind.

"All parties should cement the ties of comradely unity, cooperation and solidarity among themselves on the principle of independence and equality.

"International solidarity is essential to the struggle for socialism.

"Now that the imperialists and reactionaries are attacking socialism and people in an international collusion the parties which are building socialism or aspiring after it should defend and advance socialism on an international scale and strengthen mutual support and solidarity in their efforts for social justice, democracy, the right to existence and peace against imperialist domination, subjugation by capital and neo-colonialism...."

Unity, No. 9 for 1992

After publication of Pyongyang Declaration in the Bolshevik press the negative appraisal of the Russian authorities appeared in

the "yellow" press, arousing the interest of the public. The Russian News Agency *News* addressed a number of questions to N.A. Andreyeva whose answers were carried by a number of newspapers:

Question: *What were your impressions of recent trip to the DPRK?*

Answer: I am convinced that genuine socialism gives people peaceful life, prosperity and confidence in future. Last year in Pyongyang every fourth family moved from one-roomed flat into 3-5-roomed flat. Crimes were entirely eradicated. It is a pity and shame that we, the country with by far greater potential, are worse off.

Question: *But don't newspapers tell us of "south Korean economic miracle"?*

Answer: They "tell" what the authorities order, but keep quiet about the fact that people flee to the DPRK from this "miracle". Last year the DPRK received 150,000 persons of half million people who wanted to move from south Korea.

City News
June 27, 1992, Kursk
(Published for the first time)

* * *

ON THE SITUATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST AND WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT AT THE PRESENT STAGE

Speech Delivered at the June Plenary Meeting of the ABCP in 1992

Here I should like to mention one problem which was solved by the Secretariat of the CC of the ABCP after the inaugural conference of the party. This problem concerns the establishment and strengthening of contacts with the international communist and working-class movement. In the course of tour of Athens, Pyongyang, Belgium and Germany and through the talks held in our country we established contacts with a considerable number of communist parties through their leadership or their delegates invested with corresponding powers. This allows us to examine more widely the processes which are now taking place in world communist movement and, generally, in our stormy and seething world. As a result, we were able to more correctly decide on the basic direction of our activity, its possible prospects and tendencies.

Leaving for the rendezvous with Bush, President Yeltsin declared that the Constitutional Court would put an end to communism. At an interview held abroad Gorbachev grumbled that if one

head was cut off communism several new heads would grow out of it. I do not like to mention what moral-political degradation our recent leading party-bureaucrats fell into. I only say that at interviews, meetings and talks our foreign comrades asserted, basing themselves on facts, that whether communism will exist or not does not depend on Bush or Kohl or Yeltsin or Gorbachev. As long as in the world there are exploitation and oppression of the working people, communism and communists do exist, they multiply their ranks, drawing lessons from their failure and setbacks, and lead mankind to the world where labour rules the roost and capital recedes from the stage of history. And any frenzy and repression of the authorities cannot stop this progressive development.

I had no occasion to come into direct contact with the activities of fraternal communist parties which the domestic reactionary force zealously slanders on the provocative plea of the "money of the CPSU". Visits to Pyongyang, Brussels and Dusseldorf permitted me to feel on the skin, as is said, what the international solidarity of the working people is, when in the indoor stadium in Brussels thousands of people chanted, "Long live the Soviet Union!" and "Long live Bolshevism!" and when other people in a big stadium of the Philips Complex rose from their seats shouting "Internationalism!" and "Solidarity!". Particularly, of these many thousands of people over 70 per cent were youth, boys and girls of the Ruhr industrial district. Allow me to convey you their brotherly feelings, anxiety for what happened in the USSR and with the CPSU, as well as their international solidarity.

After meetings and talks with the delegates of communist parties of other countries I began to understand keenly the faults of the CPSU before the international communist and working-class movement and what a terrible blow the Soviet opportunists and renegades, agents of international imperialism, stooges of Bush and Miterrand and the like dealt at the international communist and working-class movement. At first this blow caused bewilderment among people like among us. But today it passes by. They draw conclusions from what happened. To be frank, the most strict and principled conclusions. We may not always like them but we will gradually realize that our foreign comrades were right. They are right in the main and we will feel our guilt before them. They, like all of us, never had occasion to study at a children's palace, to go to children's camps and study at universities. All their life and fate are dedicated to the struggle for the interests of the working class and all others made destitute by capital. Involuntarily I ask myself: What will be in store for all of us, the people of the USSR, our children and grandchildren if we fail to restore the power of the working people?

Together with A.A. Lapin and V.I. Klushin I had an occasion to have talks with the delegates of the party of a socialist country and

those of several communist parties of capitalist and developing countries. In other words, I acquainted myself with the main political forces of the international communist and working-class movement and the working people of those countries and listened to their opinions. Contacts were established with the parties active from underground and those waging armed struggle. This enabled us to draw the following conclusions.

First, the present restoration of capitalism which was realized in the USSR by reactionary forces at home and abroad becomes a chief factor of world politics for many years like the October Revolution in 1917. The international character of bourgeois counterrevolution necessitates internationalizing the struggle against it. In other words, it requires the international communist and working-class movement and all the progressive forces of the world to join the struggle. World capital fears the international solidarity and hinders in every way the formation of a united front of the struggle which the future belongs to historically.

Secondly, the European communist parties which followed the CPSU and its opportunist policy which brought about restoration of capitalism in recent decades are in acute crisis. Some of them are going over to the social democratic position or in some cases simply to bourgeois-liberalistic one (particularly such was the case with the Italian Communist Party). Such parties completely broke off with Marxism-Leninism, the scientific world outlook of the working class and are going out of the framework of the international communist movement. The other group of parties are lost, cannot appreciate from the angle of class position what occurred in the USSR and in European socialist countries and are seeking a "third line". And lastly, yet other group strengthens the Marxist-Leninist flank of communist movement while reconstructing the parties of a Leninist type corresponding best to the interest of the struggle between labour and capital. The process of demarcation is a painful one requiring extension of our contacts with fraternal parties.

In the field of ideology the process of rebirth, purification and strengthening of communist movement proceeds through the understanding that with anti-Stalinism it is impossible to go a long way, win victory over the power of capital, build socialism in general or defend the social gains of the working people. Comrades from a number of communist parties in Brussels requested me to deliver the report *Anti-Stalinism Is a Trojan Horse in the International Communist Movement in the Latter Half of the 20th Century*. The report was translated in many languages, published and widely disseminated. In the course of five-hour debate we finally reached the conclusion that anti-Stalinism is the most dangerous form of the contemporary opportunism in the international communist movement. The struggle with it is placed on the agenda.

Thirdly, international capital calculated that the collapse of the

USSR and European socialist countries would help it to colonize them and turn them into their sources of raw materials and cheap labour forces and thus prevent the oncoming economic crisis. However, the calculation of its bosses did not come true. The "civilized" West was not saved from the crisis. In capitalist countries unemployment and social tension are threateningly increasing and national and racial enmity bursts out frequently like in Los Angeles and Toronto. The danger of outbreak of the third world war, which may start in our territory, increases.

Foreign conductors of bourgeois counterrevolution did not expect that the restoration of capitalism in European socialist countries would face such difficulties. FRG cannot "digest" GDR with the population of 17 million though it already had invested about 80 billion dollars. Kohl declined to subsidize Yeltsin because according to his account more than 100 billion dollars should be invested in the region of the former GDR. Moreover, the united anti-restoration front is formed and extended in the East Europe. The representatives of communist parties of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia told about this. Here the communists of the USSR must fulfil their own class duty.

Fourthly, the participants in discussions which were held in Athens, Pyongyang, Brussels, Moscow, Dusseldorf and Essen came to the conclusion that it is necessary to render international support to the countries building socialism in Asia today (China, the DPRK, Viet Nam and Laos) and to heroic Cuba, in particular, for today the subversive activities of imperialism (and our restorationists and renegades) are aimed at and concentrated on them.

Fifthly, the temporary setbacks of socialism in the USSR and Europe placed on the agenda the problem of international class organization of the working people. When the situation in the USSR and the international communist movement was discussed, we more than once reverted to this problem. The Pyongyang Declaration about which our mass media keeps silence becomes a first step towards preparation for solving this matter. Over 80 delegations signed it.

The ABCP considers that preparation for the reconstruction of a coordinating structure itself will promote the consolidation of progressive forces and their socio-class differentiation and demarcation with opportunists and class collaborators.

In connection with this the delegation of the ABCP in Pyongyang refused to sign the appeal worked out by Tulkin (the Russian Communist Workers' Party), Prigarin (the Union of Communists), Ponomarev (the Socialist Party of the Working People) and some representatives of parties in East European countries. The appeal was born after the visit of above-mentioned comrades to Razumovski, well-known ambassador of the USSR in Pyongyang. The appeal had little of the new in comparison with the Pyongyang Declaration politically and ideologically and was, in essence, opposed to the

united front of the communist parties which adopted the Pyongyang Declaration. I came to know that the signing of the document proceeded in Moscow. The representatives of many communist parties including those who met on May Day in Brussels assumed a negative attitude to it.

Sixthly, there is the most complex problem which requires special attention. Today it is necessary for us to decide on a direction which can represent the future in consideration of diversity of the international communist movement. Of course, those organizations which followed Khrushchev-Gorbachev's opportunism were thrown into a more serious crisis than that the parties of International II had undergone in the period of World War I and after it. The crisis was settled by conversion of these parties to the ranks of social-democracy. We observe a phenomenon similar to this in our era, too. What is main here is that the leaders and ideologues of those parties were incapable of making a principled appraisal of the crisis of socialism in the USSR and European socialist countries, describing bourgeois restoration as "democratization".

We are greatly interested in the Left Marxist-Leninist parties. We heard for over 30 years that they were "Stalinists", "Maoists" or "Enverhoxhaists". But are "Maoism" and "Hoxhaism" not payment for the Right-opportunist errors committed by the CPSU, Italian, French, British, Spanish and other communist parties? Of course, the sin is ascribable, above all, to their leadership but not to proletarian stratum of these parties. It is characteristic that these parties did not yield to anti-Stalinism and the opportunist decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, for which they were attacked not only by imperialist forces but also by the main forces of "communist movement" including the CPSU. In socialist countries the supporters of their view were often expelled from the communist parties they belonged to. There were cases in which they were repressed by power organs. Those who were not ready for such development of event lost stimulus to political activity and entered the academic world or retired into private life. As a result, the cause of socialist construction suffered from this.

We were fairly sufficiently acquainted with two Marxist-Leninist parties—the Belgian Labour Party and the Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany (MLPG). As for scores of other parties we only had talks with their leaders. All these parties have two characteristics. First, they are workers' parties in their composition and, secondly, the parties of young people. The MLPG was founded in 1982 on the basis of the youth league—a young communist league of the FRG which disagreed in view with the Communist Party of Germany led by Herbert Miss. They disagreed in the appraisal of the policy of the GDR which they considered as opportunist and bureaucratic. Stephen Engel, General Secretary of the CC of the MLPG is 35 years old. He came from the workers of Krupp Works and is now

active as a party functionary. In the party there are about 30 functionaries. Other leaders, too, are all young and of worker origin. They naturally take pride in this. The picture of the Belgian Labour Party is similar to this.

After annexation of the GDR to the FRG the correctness of many of their appraisals became obvious. More workers and young people joined the party. This party became an influential one in the eastern regions of Germany though its many supporters do not agree to it that there was "bureaucratic capitalism" in the GDR, that is, to the underestimation of the socialist gains accomplished by the German working people. At the time of a recent strike in the Ruhr industrial district where the MLPG is active 17,000 workers of the steel works joined in an "illegal" strike (that is officially unlawful and not registered) under the slogans of the party.

The Communist Party of Germany which together with the bosses of trade union dissuaded the workers from joining in the strike met with defeat. At present the MLPG is preparing for new strikes against dismissal and unemployment at Krupp and Tissen, Mennesmen Steel Works, which produce 90% of steel in Germany. (Now unemployment in the FRG reaches 7-8% and that in the former GDR exceeds 50%. I remind you that unemployment allowance is paid at end of the year and that the subsidy does not cover even house rent.)

Today the monopolies in Ruhr plan to reduce by over 30% the number of steelmakers. The MLPG requested to shorten weekly working hours up to 35 hours without cutting down the workers' salary and thus to keep their jobs. Workers took up this slogan. A new class struggle will break out.

Availing ourselves of the opportunity of being illegally conducted by the member of Workers' Council, a Marxist-Leninist, around the biggest steel works of Krupp (The size of the works required riding in a car in the premise), we mounted one of blast-furnaces which were higher than one hundred metres. We talked with steelmakers and felt the might of the class consciousness of the German proletariat which did not know socialism. It may be good that they did not know such socialism as we had in recent decades.

The MLPG did not register and is not going to do so. On the basis of neutrality it uses the Workers' Education Hall where they stay for several days like in rest home. Its library has all the books of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, 15 volumes of Stalin's works (we have 13 volumes) and works of Dimitrov, Thalmann, Pieck and Mao Zedong. There are the bust of Lenin and hung on the wall were portraits of Marx and Stalin and photographs showing the struggle of German workers in the 19th century. All are done quietly, modestly, with dignity, without fuss and self-praise. Comparison with our clamorous meetings and conferences is not in our favour.

The theoretical education of active party members leaves some-

thing to be desired. Hence much illusion and incorrect appraisal in relation to Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and the like. They joined in discussion with dignity, listening attentively to what others spoke. Long discussions with us seem to have their result. I got entirely good impression. We almost completely coincided in the opinion concerning the basic political problems. We can and must successfully cooperate with such people. I am inclined to think that the future belongs to them in the communist and working-class movement. The MLPG is connected with a number of Marxist-Leninist parties which also came to Dusseldorf. I, for the first time, came to know that 65 of 73 provinces of the Philippines were involved in resistance movement. A quarter of the number of rural villages in the Philippines is administered by people's power. In Turkey the units of communist party are conducting a guerrilla warfare against the government army. Communists issue their own newspapers and magazines that carry some articles concerning the activities of the ABCP. By the way, yesterday I received magazines from Italy and Brazil. The first of them carried the Rules of the ABCP and the second of them, my article, which I saw for the first time printed.

The interest in the ABCP is great. The communists and the working people in other countries are expecting much of us. Their expectations should not be betrayed. Today the plenary meeting here discussed fundamental problems. Without arranging the organizational party work, we cannot fulfil our tasks. Only when we base ourselves on it can we extend our political and propaganda work. It is the time for us to abandon the old Adam the ruling party handed down to us. If we throw it away, we will emerge victorious.

* * *

FAILURE OF REFORMATION OR WHERE IS A LIGHT IN THE END OF THE TUNNEL?

After 1917 on one-sixth of the globe there appeared a country—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. For 70 years of her existence she by right occupied a place of the world's great power, adorned many glorious pages of the history of mankind with labour, talents and bravery of her sons and daughters. No one is allowed to cross out or rewrite this, however tempting it might seem to someone.

In the first place the Soviet Union is associated with the global positive changes which cannot help but impress any impartial man, the changes which lie in the channel of world-historic progress. I would like to cite some of these changes testifying to the deep-going social developments in the international human community of the 20th century, the developments which do not suit all, but which it is

necessary to take into consideration at present and will be necessary all the more in future.

Above all, it is the historic defeat of fascism. The Soviet Union made decisive contribution to this defeat, offering more than 20 million lives of her best sons and daughters on the altar of victory. In the fatal fight were saved not only the foundation of socialism in our country but also the Western democracy which in turns fell to knees before military successes of Hitler.

Split of the world into two socio-economic systems opposed to each other in many respects precipitated the collapse of colonial system, inhumanity of which became incompatible with the humanitarian tendency of the 20th century. Without the Soviet Union this liberation process would have threatened to drag on for centuries.

The postwar bipolar structure of the world and the missile-nuclear parity achieved by the two world systems allowed mankind to develop for half a century without the all-embracing military cataclysms or, in other words, without world wars. However zealously the anti-Soviet clique tried to prove the "bellicosity of communism", the rulers and people of the Western world knew that the Soviet Union would never take the "path of war" if she was not compelled to. The policy of peaceful coexistence of states certainly did not freeze the status quo on the globe nor remove the question of the world struggle between labour and capital on the international arena, the struggle through which social progress is now made. Peaceful coexistence only put the class struggle in the civilized channel and saved the world community from self-destruction.

The principles of peaceful coexistence of states were formulated by many distinguished brains from Kant to Gandhi. But only socialism materialized them, and made them one of the leading factors of world politics for half a century in the inter-state relations. Without socialism these principles would have remained only abstract appeals of humanists and pacifists.

The Soviet Union is also associated with the social gains of the working people in all continents. International capital deprived of the possibility of struggle by force with the socialist countries was compelled to moderate its ardour on the arena of struggle in its countries. Of course, conducive to this were scientific-technical progress, the possibility of employing cheap labour force of the "third world countries" and a series of other temporary reasons. The working people of the developed capitalist countries who have attained fairly high living standards undoubtedly have benefited from this.

Finally, the Soviet Union where 85 per cent of the population was illiterate till the October Revolution in 1917 has converted into the country of overall literacy and opened the era of entrance of man into the cosmos and peaceful use of the atomic energy. In the Soviet Union unemployment and national discord are gone and the dependable system of social security for the working people has been established. This contribution to the humanization of the world community could serve as the source of national pride for the citizens of any country. It is regrettable that in the Soviet Union this progressive process was retarded beginning with the '60s and then was reversed. Where is the main source of such reactionary metamorphosis?

It is no secret for anyone that the CPSU shaped and directed the home and foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Unlike feudalism and capitalism the development of socialism can be achieved only in a planned manner and ought to be based on the steadily developing science. All spontaneity here is ruinous from the beginning. History showed that to call oneself the leading force of society and to be such in reality are not the same. The history of the CPSU bespeaks this.

The strength of any political party of the working people lies in the existence of scientifically substantiated programme, defence of social interests of its class, existence of right concepts of the achievement of strategic aims dictated by these interests. For the CPSU the interests of the working class, peasantry of collective and state farms and the working intellectuals were these interests from the beginning. All kinds of deviation from them were and are social betrayal. From the latter half of the '50s the CPSU began to shift from the scientific proletarian position to the position of petty-bourgeois policy under the influence of its opportunist leadership. The anti-Stalin campaign launched after the 20th Congress of the CPSU became the ideological evasion from this. This campaign led to the undermining of the authority of socialism, serious difficulties in the world communist movement, confrontation with the Communist Party of China, and then of the Soviet Union with the Chinese People's Republic, activation of the opponents of socialism in the people's democratic countries of Europe. In the Soviet Union party and Soviet cadres were replaced in a mass, the basic propositions of Marxism-Leninism as the scientific outlook of the working class and the socialist forces of our times began to be eroded.

As is known, opportunism manifests itself in the lack of principle, short-sighted pursuit of temporary individual and yet often illusory profits to the detriment of basic interests of the working people. For example, such were Khrushchev's maize epoch, Brezhnev's turn of the course of northern rivers to the south and other similar projects. Precisely the lack of principle and short-sightedness became the factors which determined the policy of the CPSU in this historical period. The disastrous effect of such policy was at first concealed and partly compensated by the real achievements of the past which created unprecedented reserve of stability of the socialist system. In the Khrushchev's and Brezhnev's time the principal miscalculation in the economy was particularly dangerous.

The economy began to be oriented not toward the reduction of

cost of products and increase of production of high-quality commodities by using scientific achievements and new technology but toward gaining profit from each production by unfounded jacking up of prices of commodities. Short-sighted pursuit of individual benifits, one-sided orientation of production toward such profit led to the retardation of national economic development, reduction of return of fund, gradual devaluation of rouble. Reduction of prices ceased and the prices of consumer goods began to rise with vanishment of cheap assortments. Scientific and technical progress retarded, and the tempo of development of production and the growth of labour productivity decreased.

The opportunist economic policy led to the increase of gap between the highly and low paid. The "shady" economy gains strength, giving rise to the private enterprising elements which started initial capital accumulation. The shady elements are joined by the corrupted Soviet and party bureaucracy. The tendency of obliteration of class differences began to be covered by social differentiation and social polarization. Stalin was right, asserting that for opportunists "socialism means to breed and enrich bourgeoisie". In these conditions the working people lost moral stimulus to labour and showed indifference and then aversion for all state and social affairs. Violation of labour discipline and stealing of public property grew.

Opportunism, having occupied the command post in the CPSU, became Right opportunism. The phenomena of the ruling state opportunism had naturally its own reasons. But this is a special enormous thema which is hardly to be covered in a lecture. Proceeding from Khrushchev's concept "complete and ultimate victory of socialism" through Brezhnev's ideological script of "developed socialism", the ruling opportunism completed its evolution with the complete and final degeneration of the upper crust of the CPSU into betrayers and renegades, servants of transnational capital and homegrown criminal bourgeoisie and into destroyers of the great power and liquidators of the party of the working class. Gorbachevites, Yakovlevites, Yeltsinites, Shevardnadzeites, Kravchukites and Nazarbaevites who recently sang *Internationale* before telecamera are now blaring out about the "collapse of socialism", "historical impasse", "unsuccessful experiment", demonstrating their intellectual poverty and moral degradation.

Not socialism and communist idea sustained historical defeat but the weedy fruitless opportunism which usurped them. Political double-dealers, unprincipled careerists who obtained the confidence of people by swindle and hypocrisy and ascended the top of the party pyramid of the CPSU are now ready to rely on anyone—criminals, the dregs of society, the sworn enemy of mankind, fascists—to hang on the neck of people in the capacity of their "rulers". Not the party of communists ceased its existence but the party "structures" engen-

dered by opportunism revealed its inconsistency and crumbled, paralysed and rotten up to the root. They did not represent the Leninist party long ago but objectively stood against it. Therefore the ABCP is opposed to the revival of such party and the grounds for this attitude are given in my article "Is It Necessary to Revive the CPSU?"

The history of recent decade clearly showed that opportunism inevitably and normally brings about restoration of capitalism, which has now led the country to catastrophe. There is no way out on the path of bourgeois restoration which throws the working people into the unprecedented disaster.

In our days the initial accumulation of criminal capital is nearing completion. Big capital is being rapidly concentrated. The former state property of the Soviet Union lost socialist character and has become the foundation of state capitalism. In the present conditions it is easy to convert public property into private property or appropriate it. The gold reserve and strategic reserves of the great power were exhausted. "Pragmatists" in the government are gradually driving out shady pseudo democrats. The former party "nomenclature" openly goes over to the service to the capital on the way of monopolization. The circle of betrayal of the interests of the common people was formed. Counterrevolution is on the threshold of transition to the authoritarian-fascist method of exercise of power.

In all spheres of social life an attack is brought on the main productive force of society, the working people of town and country who often frenziedly but spontaneously resist exploitation and plunder. Practically they were deprived of their savings, which were "eaten out" by a galloping inflation and 50-100-fold devaluation of rouble. Wages are withheld for many months. The pensioners who live in dire poverty and are on the threshold of biological survival are given the scanty pension which is reduced in quiet without notice. Above all genocide is inflicted on the old generation, which is revenge of bourgeois counterrevolution for socialism built and defended in battles.

In all regions of the country death rate threateningly exceeds birth rate. The number of suicide in the first half of 1992 nearly equals the total number of human loss in the ten years of war in Afghanistan. Inter-nationality and social conflicts, fast-increasing crimes are taking toll of tens of thousands of human lives. Normal functioning of health services discontinues, becoming dearer and inaccessible to the common people. The working people cannot afford the normal holidays they had under the so-called "administrative-command system".

The situation of the young generation is dramatic. Speculative business does not give the young people stable guaranteed earnings. Pseudo democratic charm of the new way of life revealed spiritual emptiness and offered no prospect. Drug addiction, prostitution,

pornography, cruelty and toleration are ruining ever-growing number of young people. Graduates from university, technical schools and professional-technical schools began to replenish the number of the unemployed. In reality bare existence became the fate of students. Secondary schools are on the threshold of total mass-destruction. The best individual educational establishments cannot check the drastic fall of culture and morality of the young generation. Capital which acceded to power converted cosmopolitanism into anti-patriotism of belligerent character.

Every month in the country about one thousand enterprises are being closed down. The army of the unemployed increases. The working people depoliticized under the "developed socialism" are being declassed. The notorious barter which makes it possible to obtain private car and video techniques at the expense of enterprise induces some workers to have a temporary illusion of their cherished desire being attained. Bribery of individual ranks of the working people extinguishes the seat of social explosion but broadens the space of the hidden seething volcanic lava of general dissatisfaction ready to burst out to the expanse of large-scale civil wars with unpredictable consequences. The objective factors of resistance to bourgeois counterrevolution are formed. The working class of the country is gradually realizing its historical responsibility. Its slogans and political demands are heard all the more aloud and clearer. Strikes began to be politicized.

Farming system is burning in the slow fire of class hatred. Not the notorious "nomenclature" but the peasantry of collective and state farms increase resistance to the capitalization of villages. The new way of life of the Soviet villages came into conflict with the "idiotism of village life" (K. Marx) of private producers. Resistance to the destruction of the property of collective and state farms increases. No weapon given by the authorities nor record financing (hundreds or thousands of times more budget is allotted to farmers than to collective peasants), nor the right to purchase and sale of land is capable of converting farming and farm labouring system into the backbone of agricultural production. In the Soviet countryside there was evidently lack of the private-owner instincts which came into conflict with the social experience of collective peasantry.

Intellectuals were converted into the hostage of counterrevolution. Even their elite part responsible for the ideological preparation for the restoration of capitalism suffered defeat. Willy does not bathe on the Azure Coast but divers from robbers—entrepreneurs or corrupted Yeltsinite-Gorbachevite upper crust that grew rich in the people's disaster. Rapturous cries are heard no more on the part of the former "designers" of perestroika. From the disorderly ranks of the representative "elite" culture are raised groans reflecting not only utter bewilderment but also nostalgia for the past, stability, security and order. Sergei Zaligin well expressed this longing for the

loss in his story *Somehow* carried in the traditionally "democratic" journal *New World* (April 1992).

"Trade with brains" and "working hands" in foreign markets is far from paying. Earnings of emigrants from the country sound only impressive only when exchanged for depreciated rouble. In reality all turned out social non-right and hired slavery in alien countries.

Restoration of capitalism engendered spiritual poverty in the country. Recently no genuine book, nor movie nor musical production was produced. Theatres, movie production, belletristic literature, art, architecture are on the verge of ruin. TV and radio broadcasting and other means of mass media are gradually parting with pluralism, converting into the official propaganda organ of the government. Pressure is applied on opposition in the press and TV economically. In the Supreme Soviet is now debated the act which is actually designed to introduce censure. "Democrats" are assured that it is supposedly intended against communists. In spite of the illusory character of the set tasks the "assault on Ostankino" on June 22 this year reflected the discontent of the masses at the devaluation of pluralism. The working people are deprived of the last possibility of expressing publicly their attitude toward those responsible for the critical situation.

Science and scholars are in more than deplorable condition. No small number of them joined cooperatives, business, trade and the sphere of service. The rest of them are dragging out miserable existence, ashamed of their past "democratic" activity. Many of them began to sober down to see how scientific schools are destroyed, how the traditions are ruined, how the results of scientific researches of whole generations of scholars are stolen and how inventions and technology constituting the pride of the nation drift away to the West for next to nothing. Our state is losing the last positions in the world science, the positions where we went ahead of others for decades. The genocide of talents and genius of scholars of the country cannot be measured by financial or moral yardstick.

The foreign policy is so anti-national, reactionary and hopeless as the domestic policy of the leadership of Russia, which renders all conceivable assistance and support to its reactionary partner in the so-called "near foreign land". In foreign policy the line is pursued of struggle with those regimes in the former Soviet republics which strove in this or that form to preserve socialist gains, check the sale of the socialist motherland and the line of active, even military, support of the so-called "democratic" forces which are restoring capitalism. The governments of restorationists are directly responsible for the fact that in our country the flames of war and conflicts are spreading, hundreds of thousands of the Soviet people are becoming refugees, genocide of small nationalities is carried out and the rights and legal interests of 25 million Russian people are placed in a state of hostage of local nationalists. Hopeless flounder of the Russian

diplomacy in the "near foreign land", its demagogic appeal for peace, proposed mediator's efforts everywhere—all this is camouflage of the ruinous policy of national betrayal.

So much provocative are the threats to use force in the regions of the "near foreign land", which are heard from the part of Yeltsin, Rutsky and others.

In the "far foreign lands" the course is pursued of the definitive liquidation of the so-called "pro-communist" regimes in East Europe (Serbia, Chernogoria), of discrediting socialism in China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Viet Nam, Cuba, and of assisting reaction in the struggle against the communist, working-class and national-liberation movement in the world. Union of restorationists and party nomenclatural capital of the CPSU, a handful of generals and high-ranking officers who broke their oath, dignitary diplomats and the state security service men who betrayed the cause of socialism—these are those who hold sway over a ball on the foreign policy arena. They are engaged in selling the national wealth of the country cheaper. Here special efforts are directed to having previous consent of extensive assistance from the international capital as sponsor, investor and foreign-policy partner and ally.

Revelry in betrayal to the nation and anti-national acts in the domestic and foreign policies of restorationists are receiving ever-increasing rebuff on the part of the socialist and patriotic political forces of our country. Many people understood that such policy leads the motherland to the abyss of semi-colonial dependence, increases the danger of a new world conflict. Some betrayers-renegades in power already demand direct foreign intervention in our affairs. This aggravates tension within and without the country extremely.

Today the crisis of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union has reached such an extent that disintegration of production, total catastrophe of society and paralysis of power may follow. In the end the social base from which perestroika started was undermined. Crisis everywhere leads to split in the camp of reformers, wavering, desertion and undisguised betrayal. A large number of early zealous "democrats" go over to opposition (Yu. Vlasov, S. Stankevich and others). There takes place the endless reshuffle of supporters of Yeltsin's reform in which the same persons turn up. Reckless "democrats" set up cries: "Make a breakthrough toward conversion into private ownership", "Carry out structural revolution through bankruptcy", "Stop the sallies of the Reds," "No election nor referendums" and so on.

Behind all these "noisy effect" of the political panoptic survey new regrouping of forces began stealthily in the ruling class of restorationists. The cosmopolitan, compradore, pro-Western neo-bourgeoisie which utterly compromised itself is gradually being driven out of leadership over the restoration of capitalism. National

capital comes to the foreground of the socio-political life of Russia and of most of the former republics, though each "sovereign state" is under different ideo-political banner. The fraction of neo-bourgeoisie which has now gone bankrupt is being removed from power so as to save restoration itself, clean and touch up its facade and disorganize the resistance of the working people.

Today the Russian neo-bourgeoisie is actively concentrating its intellectual force. It hurriedly forms its political parties (entrepreneurs themselves lead most of them), and seizes key posts in the state power organs. Nationalism presents its ideological base. The force of the national bourgeoisie lies in the state-patriotic principles which attracted many people including servicemen in the period of the collapse of the great power. The mass foundation of national capital is the petty-bourgeois layers of town and country who politically lean to patriotic organizations. Alliance with national capital was entered by socialist and other parties of "petty shopkeepers" and also by the "party nomenclatural" capital of the CPSU which feels itself precarious with the pseudo democrats who undertook to search the "gold of party".

The strength of the "party nomenclatural" capital lies in the stable connections with technocrats, leaders of big industrial enterprises, and scientific complexes. In the present conditions in which in the enterprises party organizations were dissolved and trade unions fell apart and the role of administration sharply rose. On its position will directly depend, whom production and scientific research collectives will follow. The collectives now already cannot afford to remove useless administration. Now it is the prerogative of Yeltsinites. The struggle of the government and national patriots for technocrats is going on everywhere. The government recently raised the director's salary up to 100-150 roubles, which is comparable to the earnings of middle entrepreneur.

Acute struggle between cosmopolitan and national capital took place at the 6th Congress of the People's Deputies of Russia (April 1992). But the course of the congress showed that the competing fractions of bourgeoisie have so far similar potential and yet are not prepared for decisive scramble for power. Opposition in the parliament cost Yeltsin and Gaidar much blood, but went to compromise in the end. After the congress the strife of the rivals became more intense, though the government tried with the new party of renovation to reach consensus with the leading technocrats with a view to make them continue reform. On the other hand, the new party of economic reform which was founded by entrepreneur Borov organized "presentation" of Russian national capital at the hand of French, Swedish, Finnish and other countries's businessmen.

Activation of national neo-bourgeoisie conditioned notable shift to the Right not only among patriotic but also communist parties and groups. Indicator of this political shift became the Russian Cathedral

(June 1992) in which the egoistic aims of the Russian national bourgeoisie were camouflaged by writers Rasputin and Belov, leaders of the Russian Communist Workers' Party Ampilov and Tyulkin and communist Umalatov. They all looked meaningful among those in black shirt with arm band adorned with reformed and modernized swastika. With a view to demonstrate support of people the cathedral sent Ampilov and General Makashev to storm the telecast tower in Ostankino, forbidding dissemination of communist press by the way. In his report the former general of the State Security Commission Sterling set forth the anti-communist line which was professionally elaborated.

Today many people predict Yeltsin's impending resignation, as if his days were numbered. The resignation of Yeltsin's government which has brought restoration of capitalism into impasse, of course, is inevitable and desirable. But more necessary is rejection of all the policy of restoration of capitalism. The ABCP proceeds from the fact that today the unity of action of communists and genuine patriots in the struggle against all the line of restoration of capitalism is most pressing. Such unity has the common aim: revival of renovated socialism and integrity of the great power. Socialism and unity of the great power are bound up inseparably. The ABCP is opposed to the participation of the "communist" young ignoramuses in the governments of "people's trust", "salvation committees" founded by different fractions of neo-bourgeoisie. Today all kinds of pursuit of ministerial seats in counterrevolutionary governments is betrayal of the working people.

In our days, as never before, necessary is the united anti-restoration movement in the country, capable of playing the role of the third decisive force, the force capable of withstanding all kinds of intrigues of reaction in whatever "humanitarian" and "patriotic" clothes it may be dressed up. It is regrettable that some leaders of the parties founded on the ruin of the CPSU have no clear attitude to this question. The ABCP considers that the main method of struggle with the bourgeois counterrevolution is the general political strike of the working people capable of overthrowing the present regime without armed violence.

The destructive processes continuing in our country from 1985 are doomed, in our opinion, to failure, because they conflict with the main sector of socio-economic development of mankind.

First, the world tendency of development of the productive forces is connected with concentration of production, its internationalization, consolidation of the planning principle in the economy. Restorationists wrecked the unified production-management complex of the country, rejected planned character, swung the flywheel of decentralization of production and property, carrying it to national quarters and regions. In our country only the capital separated from the production base is concentrated, which confirms its criminal-predatory character.

Secondly, historical progress objectively washes away the border of classes and social stratums, having the tendency of social progress to social homogeneity. Opposition of labour to capital retards this progress, which is free under socialism. Reviving neo-bourgeoisie under the slogan of human rights, the country reverses to the dangerous antagonism and confrontation in social sphere.

Thirdly, from century to century, from decade to decade the acuteness of racial and nationality confrontation is removed or dulled in ethnic relations. Socialism successfully solved this question on the basis of all-people property, achieved here amazing successes, demonstrating friendly mutual assistance and friendship of nations to the world. Today in the United States negroes become generals and senators and even in the Republic of South Africa the situation with apartheid is being straightened out. But our bourgeoisie which has acceded to power not only dissociated nations but also sets them against each other, organizes national conflicts, which develop into civil wars. When in the West the former borders of national states are losing significance in the interests of free movement of capital and labour, we are setting up borders where they ought not to be.

The above-mentioned makes it possible to draw conclusion that the restoration process in our country is incompatible with the general laws governing social progress and the basic tendencies of development of mankind. This has brought restoration into impasse and makes the defeat of socialism in the Soviet Union temporary.

Restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and European socialist countries has changed the alignment of forces on the global scale in favour of imperialism and reaction. It served as the beginning of crisis in the world working-class and communist movement. An attack was brought on the three main streams of the world revolutionary process: the socialist state system, the struggle of communist parties in capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement.

Temporary defeat of socialism in Europe and in the Soviet Union objectively led to the shift of the centre of the world socialism and revolutionary movement to the Asian and Latin-American countries, which are now experiencing the concentrated pressure of the world capital. This necessitates unreserved support to the communist parties of China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Cuba, Viet Nam and Laos on the part of all the progressive forces of the world. Today there is created such situation that communist parties which followed the lead of the 20th Congress of the CPSU find themselves in a grave crisis and are steadily losing authority among the masses of people. The Marxist-Leninist parties which did not recognize the revisionist resolutions of the 20th Congress now enjoy this authori-

ty. For more than 30 years these parties were maltreated by opportunists as "pro-Stalin", "pro-Mao" and pro-Albanian ones. History of the last decade proved that their ideo-political position in the main was right. Now on the list of priorities are placed solidarity of these communist parties, unity of their actions against the common enemy, formulation of common strategy and tactics of the class struggle, restoration of coordinated structure in the international communist movement, the structure inheriting the traditions and experience of the Comintern. The first step on this complicated path was taken by the Pyongyang Declaration (April 1992) signed by more than 70 parties.

Recently Yeltsin conceitedly declared that the Constitutional Court would put a point at communism. But now on the scales of the Russian Fates is by no means placed the destiny of the communist party. Whatever decision the Constitutional Court may adopt, it cannot liquidate the communist idea. Any court is in no position to declare that one million people, living adherents of this idea, do not exist. There is no such force which can prevent the people devoted to communism from being united into the union of like-minded persons, called party.

Political parties do not cease their existence by the decrees of the President but because of objective historical conditions. Ideas do not vanish together with people but burn in the ovens of O'swiecim. They recede from the historical arena, only exhausting themselves. With ideo-political manipulation it is possible only to shade but not to remove the source of communism–conflicts between labour and capital. So far as in the world there are exploitation and oppressed working people, the communist idea and communists are to increase their ranks and learn lessons from failure and defeat.

Today on the scales of the Fates is placed not the destiny of the CPSU but that of the Russian statehood. Because destruction of legality means destruction of statehood and the rights of people. Recognition of illegal decrees of the President as "lawful" will place Russia on the brink, behind which is an abyss of legal chaos where, according to Marx's expression, in place of the weapon of criticism there inevitably comes criticism by weapon which does not require judgement of the constitutional courts, namely, a civil war.

The party of Bolsheviks-Leninists is opposed to such outcome of events. But we call the working people to those forms of struggle which will be imposed by the bourgeois counterrevolution which is developing in the direction of reaction, authoritarianism and fascism. Precisely for the purpose in August 1991 we raised the banner of Bolshevism which dropped from the trembling hands of the ruling body of the party and party staff which destroyed the CPSU. And we will not hand over this banner to anyone in whatever circumstances. I want to stress this on behalf of the ABCP which I represent in this respected auditorium.

July 14, 1992
Moscow

The lecture was read at the Moscow Soviet-American Institute of Social and Political Knowledge.

* * *

The increase of influence of the ABCP in the country caused the rise of the authority of the party in the world communist and working-class movement. During the trips to Athens, Pyongyang, Belgium, Germany and Syria and in the course of talks in our country relations with a considerable number of communist parties were established on the multilateral and bilateral basis, which makes it possible to look more widely into the processes taking places now in the world communist and working-class movement.

RIGHT OPPORTUNISM AND RESTORATION OF CAPITALISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

For all peculiarity and diverse colours the 20th century in the world history will be marked by the revolutionary symbols of the Soviet Russia, which in the thundery October 1917 indicated nations the real way out of the world crisis engendered by imperialism as the highest and last stage of capitalist socio-economic formation. This was the cruel, bloody and inhuman crisis connected with the plunder of colonies and dependent countries, endless wars developing into the world scramble for division and redivision of the world economic crises destroying and throwing back production, brutal forms of exploitation and oppression of the working people.

The October Revolution in Russia heralded that the settlement of the world antagonism between labour and capital shifted from the zero point of centuries, came to the homestretch of the world struggle. The historical era of victory of reason over force began at the same time with the epoch of transition to the new forms of social existence, to the structure connected with socialism which embodied the time-old ideas of social justice and non-adoption of exploitation of man by man. It is not through the fault of Lenin and Russian Bolsheviks that the path to the kingdom of reason proved more arduous than expected and the working people had to use force to break the counterrevolutionary resistence of landlords and bourgeoisie. The world relying on the powerful support from abroad did not go to compromise and did not surrender and therefore the workers and peasants of Russia had no other alternative but to suppress the class enemy, fighting the life-and-death struggle.

Our contemporaries, blinded by the grandioseness of the current events, considered the victorious October as the beginning of world proletarian revolution and did not take into account the fact that the world capital has real possibilities enough to realign forces and undertake a series of attempt to reverse the wheel of history, taking advantage of material-production superiority. The world capital took advantage of many things of the new system which emerged in throes. Particularly it introduced the elements of planning principle into the system of capitalist economy. This allowed capitalism to mitigate economic crises, if not remove them, and dull their destructive character.

To smother socialism in its cradle the world capital risked giving rise to the fascist regimes, dreaming of directing their murderous state terrorism to the Soviet Union. But overall crusade against socialism did not happen. The wise far-sighted Soviet diplomacy frustrated the insidious designs of English and French pharisees as well as of adventurous pretenders to world domination in Germany, Italy and Japan. In the Second World War the Western democracies were compelled to become the allies of the state of proletarian dictatorship, which according to Winston Churchill, "compelled imperialists to fight imperialists". In the fatal battles were saved not only socialism which was being built and proved its vitality but also the so-called Western democracies, which by turns fell under the iron boots of the aggressor.

The Soviet Union emerged before the whole world as the leading force of anti-fascist resistance. Socialism enjoyed gratitude and respect of the world's peoples. The victory of the peace-loving peoples over fascism conditioned the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism. Together with this some countries in Europe and Asia separated from capitalism and took the path of socialist transformation. The international working class increases the number of its allies and forms his main bastion—the world system of socialism. The sphere of exploitation decreased.

In the 60s imperialism entered the second stage of its general crisis. The alignment of forces changed in favour of peace, people's democracy and socialism.

In the latter half of the 20th century the missile-nuclear parity was reached between the two world systems. This allowed mankind to develop for almost half a century without all-embracing war cataclysms, or, in other words, world wars. The American Pentagon not once planned preventive nuclear attacks on socialist countries. But each time their computer systems predicted the political leadership of the United States unconsoling results of the inevitable counterblows to the aggressor. World socialism came to materialize the principles of peaceful coexistence of states and make these principles the leading factors of world politics. Without socialism these principles would have remained to be abstract appeals of humanists

and pacifists.

The policy of peaceful coexistence removed the problems of struggle between labour and capital in inter-state relations. It only directed the class struggle to the channel capable of preventing the self-destruction of world community. This policy finally broke with the so-called "export of proletarian revolution" but unfortunately could not guarantee exclusion of export of counterrevolution. Because the leadership of socialist countries lent the feature of bourgeois pacifism to the policy of peaceful coexistence. This pacifism was nourished by the stabilization of capitalism.

The world capital deprived of the possibility of direct power struggle with socialist countries was compelled to moderate its ardour on the arena of class struggle within their states. This enabled the working people to win more solid social positions in the citadels of capitalist civilization and attain fairly high living standards in a number of them. Of course, conducive to this was the scientific-technical progress, the possibility of use of cheap labour of the third world countries and a number of other temporary reasons. But the leading role here belongs to the growth of influence of the international socialism compelling the capitalists to make substantial concessions to the working people in their countries.

In the Soviet Union exploitation, unemployment and national discord were gone and the dependable system of social security was established. The country in which 85 per cent of population was entirely illiterate before 1917 has converted into the country of overall literacy and became one of the trio of the most educated states in the world, opened the era of entrance of man into cosmos and peaceful use of the atomic energy and came to put out one-third of the world scientific production. Henry Kissinger observed with undisguised envy that the Soviet Union is the most solid great power of the globe in the sphere of humanitarian spirit. This was the unprecedented contribution of socialism to the world social progress and humanization of the human community.

Why was this progressive process in the Soviet Union checked and then reversed from the beginning of the 60s? Recently on the pages of *Pravda* and the *Soviet Russia* writer Boris Oleinik, deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the former Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union and one of the designers of Gorbachev's perestroika, raised a number of questions which worried society. It is useful to adduce them here.

"For what did our fathers and grandfathers lay down their lives? Where are the promised democracy and abundance? Where are human rights, namely, the right to labour, rest, education, decent pension, and to the sacred and natural thing—to give birth to children, that is, to replenish the national potential? Where is the gold reserve gone? To whom and for how much are sold half of Moscow, Behring's shelf, our friends from the near and distant countries, state

secrets, our structure, our land, our history, our national pride, our defence, the graves of our forefathers who fell for the betrayed and sold motherland, our army? How much was paid for the wild capitalism which is now introduced and to whom? How much was paid for the imposed exploitation of man by man? How much was paid for unilateral disarmament after which we were found 'naked among wolves'? How much and to whom is paid for debauchery, apology of betrayal, profanation of sacred things, destruction of family, smothering of the sentiment toward the motherland? How much and who received pay for the organization of disgraceful show unprecedented in the history of mankind where the great peoples abjectly roam about with bag under the windows of Europe, America and Africa as the last beggars?"

The questions of the famous writer reflected the tragic situation to which the country was brought. Who did it? In the opinion of Oleinik, the upper crust of the leadership of the CPSU which constitutes 0.3 per cent of all party and has formed a "new class"—"party bourgeoisie" is responsible for this.

But it is necessary to stress that the recent enthusiast of perestroika B. Oleinik curses and refutes only the "particularly rapacious form of capitalism", leaving in shadow its other "civilized" variety. Restoration of capitalism itself, its sponsors, architects, designers, troubadours, bourgeois "perestroika" itself which is actually the cause of the "global Chernobil" are left out of consideration. The supporter of the notorious "democratic platform" in the former CPSU for some reason did not utter a word about Right opportunism for which, according to the just assertion of Stalin, "socialism means the growth and enrichment of bourgeoisie". This is the opportunism which has normally developed into the undisguised restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union in the period of Gorbachev's perestroika. Precisely the opportunism which matured in the CPSU for more than three decades, occupying the command posts in the party, became the ruling state opportunism, producing a whole galaxy of renegades and betrayers, the present servants of transnational capital and homegrown criminal bourgeoisie from which even the elite intellectuals who started and welcomed Gorbachev's perestroika now came to dissociate themselves.

Let me stress that the restoration process in the Soviet Union did not start in the end of the 80s as is often considered but in the end of the 50s. The "children of the 20th Congress" not only became pioneers of Khrushchev's "thaw" but also were sponsors of the 28th Congress of the CPSU which fixed in the entirely opportunist resolutions the lack of alternative to capitalist path, "convergence" of socialism with capitalism, inevitability of destruction of the socialist socio-economic system, liquidation of the CPSU as the party of the working class and repudiation of Marxism-Leninism as the scientific proletarian world outlook.

It is no secret for anyone that the CPSU always framed and directed the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Spontaneity is categorically negative in socialist construction which ought to be carried out in a planned manner. The communist party leads this process and is held reponsible for it. The strength of the working-class party lies in the high quality of the scientifically grounded programme, organizational ability for implementing it, defence of the social interests of the working people, existence of accurately formulated strategic aims dictated by these interests. The history of the CPSU proved that to call itself the leading force of society and to be such a force in reality are by no means the same thing.

Transition of the party founded by Lenin through social-democratic degeneration to the present political non-existence, orgy of anti-communism in the country, nationalism and chauvinism which acceded to power in republics—all this began under the banner of anti-Stalinism. Its campaign was launched following the 20th Congress of the CPSU. The delegates to this congress are unlikely to have thought then what would be the outcome of Khrushchev's sensations from the sphere of the "secrets of Kremlin Palace" the majority of which, as soon turned out, were invented by intrigues and gossips. The anti-Stalin campaign was objectively directed against Leninism and against all the complicated path followed by the party and people in the construction and defence of socialism in the Soviet Union.

The precondition of anti-Stalinism in the sphere of economy was the inability of the leadership of Khrushchev, Brezhnev and then Gorbachev to overcome real difficulties in the growth of socialist production, introduction of capitalist elements in the socialist economy, which converted it into expendable and little effective economy. The social roots of anti-Stalinism lay in the emergence of the "shadowy" neo-bourgeoisie, its gradual and steady growth, appearance of the social stratums living on the labour of the working people in town and country among them, expansion of bureaucratic Soviet and party apparatus of management, alienation of elite intellectuals from the masses of people. In the sphere of domestic policy the basis of anti-Stalinism was rooted in the removal of the working class from the leadership over the state, conversion of the Soviet worker-peasant state into an "all-people state" and the working-class party into an "all-people party", the opportunist degeneration of the party and state leadership. In the sphere of the international policy it was underestimate of the class substance of peaceful coexistence of states of different socio-economic systems and gradual weakening of the international strategy of socialism.

The ideological precondition of anti-Stalinism was the inability of the leadership of the CPSU to develop Marxism-Leninism in the new historical conditions, launch effective struggle with oppor-

tunism and revisionism. Anti-Stalinism signified gradual undermining of the basic propositions of the Marxist-Leninist theory as the scientific world outlook and methodology of the working class and the socialist forces of the present times. Anti-Stalinism as all opportunism directly manifested itself in the lack of principle, nearsighted pursuit of momentary and yet often illusory individual benefits, going against the basic interests of the working people.

In the period of restoration of capitalism the anti-Stalin campaign assumed the character of hysteria and was employed by counterrevolution in destroying socialism and integrity of the thousand-year-long great power. It told on the depreciation of such sharp weapon of communists as criticism and self-criticism which in the revolutionary parties is not only the means of revealing and rectifying shortcomings but also the important means for the working class to influence the course of socio-political life. Opportunism led to gap between theory and practice, refrainment from considering Marxism-Leninism as the theoretical substantiation of the world-historic mission of the working class, dulling the revolutionary edge of theory. Theory becomes aimless and the practice of socialist construction, blind, confused, chaotic and spontaneous.

Opportunism programmed the fate of the Second International for the CPSU.

Historical experience once again confirmed the correctness of Lenin's repeated warning about the danger of the opportunist degeneration of the ruling opportunist parties. Today more and more people read J.V. Stalin's works, study and discuss them. Even Stalin's remark and appraisal which seemed doubtful earlier are now accepted as prophetic. Particularly it is the case with the proposition about aggravation of the class struggle with the advancement of the Soviet Union to socialism, or the Stalin's prevision that Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations would be maintained for no more than 50 years. Restoration of capitalism in East Europe and the tendency toward review of the postwar frontiers confirm Stalin's prevision. Following the disgraceful path beginning with Khrushchev's concept "perfect and ultimate victory of socialism" Right opportunism in the Soviet Union completed its evolution with perfect and final degeneration of the upper crust of the CPSU, which though did not convert into the class of "party bourgeoisie", successfully played the role of destroyer of socialism and liquidator of the working-class party.

Gorbachevites, Yakovlevites, Yeltsinites, Shevardnadzeites, Kravchukites and other Judas-turncoats who recently sang lustily *Internationale* before telecamera are now blaring about "collapse of socialism", "historical impasse" and "unsuccessful experiment".

Not socialism and the communist idea sustained historical defeat in the Soviet Union but the weedy fruitless opportunism which usurped them hypocritically. Political double-dealers, unprincipled

careerists, who wormed themselves into the confidence of the Soviet people by swindle and hypocrisy, having attained the top of the party pyramid of the CPSU, are now ready to rely on anyone—criminals and the dregs of society, anti-Soviet emigrants and even such sworn enemy of mankind as fascists to hang on the neck of people as their "rulers". Not the party of communists-Leninists ceased its existence, but the "party structures" engendered by opportunism which were rotten up to the roots revealed their inconsistence and collapsed. They did not embody Lenin's party but rather were objectively opposed to it.

Recently President Yeltsin conceitedly declared that the Constitutional Court would put a point to communism. Precisely to communism, because to try the party which does not exist is illogical, for it is banned. So much illogical, if not more, to let opportunists Ivashko and Kuptsov defend the party founded by Lenin. Proposals of such main grave diggers as Gorbachev, Yakovlev, Shevardnadze and Medvedev to undertake the role of such "lawyers" are genuine provocation. In our opinion, the Socialist Party of the Working People which has grown from the "democratic platform" in the CPSU, or, as is called, the "party of shopkeepers" which is the initiator of appeal to the Constitutional Court and now conducts the legal proceedings at the court has no right to represent Soviet communists. Yeltsin's mass media converted these legal proceedings into a regular anti-communist show.

Today not the destiny of the communist party is placed on the scales of the Russian Fates. Therefore, whatever judgement the Constitutional Court may pass, it cannot liquidate the communist idea and communism, even if the President insists it. Any court cannot declare that millions of people, the advocates of this idea, do not exist. There is no such force that can prevent the people devoted to communism from uniting themselves into the union of like-minded people, called a party.

Political parties recede from the arena of life not by the decrees of president or decision of court but because of objective historical conditions. Ideas do not die at the point of bayonets nor burn in the ovens of crematory. They disappear, only exhausting themselves. With the help of ideo-political manipulations it is possible only to shade but not remove the source of communism—antagonism between labour and capital. So far as in the world exist exploitation and oppression of the working people, wealth and poverty, the communist idea and communists are to be and increase their ranks and learn lessons by failure and defeat.

Today placed on the scales of the Fates is not the destiny of the CPSU but the destiny of the Russian statehood. Because destruction of legality equals the destruction of statehood, that is, the rights of people. Admission of the illegal presidential decrees as "legal" will bring Russia to the brink behind which is the abyss of legal chaos,

where, according to K. Marx's expression, in place of weapon of criticism inevitably comes the criticism by weapon which needs not appraisal, or a civil war.

The Constitutional Court, a regular round of campaign for another social ostracism of Lenin, the orgy of dismantling of all monuments in Leningrad arranged by mayor Sobchak, preparation for the pompous celebration of the first anniversary of Yeltsin's August coup and other similar acts are evidently diverting manoeuvre designed to cover up the grave crisis of the restorationist process.

Today the crisis of restoration of capitalism led to destruction of the productive forces dangerous for the functioning of society. The capitalist relations forcefully imposed on the socialist economy interrupted scientific and technical progress, destroyed the production complex of the country unique in its integrity, put the unique energetic system out of order, stopped the operation of blast furnaces, closed down up to thousands of enterprises every month. Priceless equipment and scarce raw materials are stolen and ruined, mines are waterlogged, crop rotation is not kept in the fields and lack of fodder compels the peasants to kill cattle, and transport worn away in the years of Gorbachev's perestroika is stopped. In other words, the basic tools and means of production, the material-technical base of society are being destroyed.

On the other hand, the main productive force, producers of material and spiritual well-being, faced grave crisis. The unemployed began to grow fast. The working class depoliticized under the "developed socialism" and "perestroika" is being declassed. Farming system is burning on the fire of class hatred and ruined. The way of life of the Soviet state and collective peasants came to conflict with the "idiotism of the village life" (K. Marx) of private producers. Intellectuals were put out of the orbit of creative work. Scholars and constructors join cooperatives, petty business, and go abroad. Theatres, movie production, belletristic literature and architecture are in ruins. The mass of secondary, professional-technical schools and establishments of higher education are on the brink of complete destruction. The country is on the threshold of an epidemic of infectious diseases. Lack of prospect and emptiness causes alcoholism, drug addiction, prostitution which ruin the young people. Bare existence became the fate of students and pensioners. Yearly number of suicide exceeds the number of loss of lives in the ten years of Afghan war and death rate threateningly surpasses the decreasing birth rate.

Bourgeois counterrevolution makes contradictions between the productive forces created by socialism and the capitalist production relations and also between the economic base and the present political superstructure irreconcilable. On the surface of social life these contradictions manifest themselves in the increasing resistance of the working people to the restoration of capitalism which causes

them plunder and exploitation, in the loss of socialist character of the state property of the Soviet Union and its conversion into state-capitalist property, in the inter-nationality strife in which nationalist bourgeoisie ascertains relations between them, drawing peoples into bloody massacre, in the growth of immorality and crimes which sweep the country, in the tendency of transition of the political system of restorationists to the authoritarian-fascist methods of exercise of power, in the undisguised anti-communist hysteria and the like.

The aggravation of socio-economic contradictions causes the crisis of restoration process in the country, disorganization of the ruling political structure, in the consolidation of objective conditions in the struggle with counterrevolution. Today the crisis of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union reached such extent that may follow the perfect disintegration of production, financial system and paralysis of power. The social base of counterrevolution is being undermined. Crisis is attended with split and discord in the camp of bourgeois reformists, wavering, desertion and direct betrayal. In order to save restoration itself the pro-Western, compradore, cosmopolitan and pro-Zionist fraction of bourgeoisie which went bankrupt is now gradually removed from economic guidance to restoration and from power.

In our days national capital under different ideo-political banners comes to the foreground of the socio-political life of Russia and other so-called "sovereign states". National capital actively concentrates its intellectual forces, organizes its political parties, occupies key positions in the state power organs. Its ideological signboard is nationalism. The strength of national bourgeoisie lies in the state-patriotic principles, which attracted many people including national communists and servicemen in the period of disintegration of the great power. The mass basis of national capital is the petty-bourgeois stratums of town and country which politically lean to patriotic organizations. The "party-named" capital of the CPSU formed a union with national capital.

The bitter strife between compradore and national capital in a large measure determines the ideo-political life of the country, realignment of forces in political and public organizations, some shift toward Right among the socialist and communist parties, a number of representatives of which are not unwilling to use ministerial seats proposed by national bourgeoisie in the counterrevolutionary governments which enjoy the "people's confidence". Leftist communist forces consider such unprincipled deal as betrayal of the working people, call them to form a unified anti-restorationist front in the country as the real counterbalance to any fractions of neo-bourgeoisie in power.

The crisis of restoration of capitalism also manifests itself in that the working people do not want any more to suffer poverty and sufferings and the ruling "tops" are incapable of governing, deceiving

the people. Impoverishment assumes the character of genocide of rulers-upstarts against their own people. More and more people who were stupefied and fooled by bourgeois propaganda come to be convinced of the advantages of socialism by their experience. They arrive at the conclusion that without restoring socialism it is impossible to restore the great power, which once inspired due pride in the countrymen and respect in the world's people. The objective factors for defeating counterrevolution exist. In these conditions the subjective factor acquires the decisive significance.

The basic mission of the subjective factor is to expose the anti-national policy of restorationists and opportunists to the end, clear Marxism-Leninism of petty-bourgeois revisionist distortions, develop it in the new historical conditions, work out and substantiate the programme to overcome crisis under the leadership of and in the interests of the working class and its allies, instill revolutionary consciousness in the masses of the working people, convert it into the material force capable of smashing bourgeois counterrevolution. In the opinion of Bolsheviks, these very complicated tasks can be fulfilled only by the Marxist-Leninist parties capable of overcoming one of the dangerous forms of opportunism—anti-Stalinism which played the role of a Trojan Horse in the communist movement for almost forty years.

Underestimate of the decisive role of the subjective factor in the first half of the 20th century was characteristic of the "leaders" of the Second International and the Russian Mensheviks and, toward the close of the 20th century, of Brezhnev-Gorbachev's leadership and ideologues of the communist parties which followed the lead of the CPSU. In our age the great role of the subjective factor was justly pointed out by the leaders of the Workers' Party of Korea, Comrade Kim Jong Il in particular, and a number of leaders of the Marxist-Leninist parties of European countries which did not accept opportunism in the resolutions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

The temporary defeat of socialism in the Soviet Union and Europe changed the alignment of forces in favour of imperialism and reaction, giving beginning to the crisis in the world working-class and communist movement. Gorbachev's clique dealt treacherous blows at the three basic streams of the world revolutionary process: the socialist system of states, the communist parties in the capitalist countries and national-liberation struggle. This defeat objectively led to the shift of the centre of the world socialism and revolutionary movement to Asian and Latin-American countries, which shifts from the West to the East because of objective laws, enriched by the experience of different countries. Without consideration of these realities any communist party cannot expect success in its activity.

Let me say a few words about the foreign policy of the restorationists. As is known, foreign policy is the continuance of the

domestic policy. The foreign policy of Yeltsin and Kozyrev is as anti-national, reactionary and has no prospects as the domestic policy of restorationists. Today it is divided into one for the "near foreign countries" and the one for "far-off foreign countries". The former signify the former Soviet republics, the latter, foreign states. Foreign policy is executed by the union of restorationists and the party-named capital of the CPSU, a handful of generals and high-ranking officers who broke oath, dignitaries-diplomats and State Security Commission men who betrayed the cause of peace and socialism. They are engaged in this with a view to sell the national resources of the country and to obtain overall assistance on the part of international capital—their partner and ally.

In the foreign policy toward the "near foreign countries" there comes to the foreground the struggle against those regimes which try to preserve some foundation of socialism in this or that form and, at the same time, active support, including military one, for the so-called "democratic forces" which restore capitalism. The helpless flounder of the Russian diplomacy in the "near foreign countries", its demagogic appeals for peace and proposed everywhere mediatory service—all this is the camouflage of the policy of national betrayal to the Russian and other peoples.

In the far-off foreign countries the course is followed of complete liquidation of the so-called "pro-communist" regimes in Europe (Serbia and Chernogoria), discredit of socialism in China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Viet Nam and Cuba, and of assistance to imperialism against the communist and national-liberation movement in all continents and of alliance with the reactionary regimes in Israel, Taiwan, south Korea, the Republic of South Africa. Politico-diplomatic preparations are going on for the illegal transfer of the south Kuril Islands to the Japanese. Russia is meekly taking part in the acts of imperialists against the Iraqi people, applies sanctions against Libya, has broken the traditional friendly relations with Arabian peoples.

The ABCP understands all the acuteness of situation which is being created in the Near East. The point is not only that the land occupied by Israel is still not returned to the Arabians and the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence continue to be trampled. It seems to us that the main danger to the just and lasting peace in the Near East now comes from the monopoly capital and expansionist policy of the United States, which, taking advantage of the collapse of the Soviet Union, methodically and persistently pursues the line of converting the region into their hereditary estate, impudently interfering in the internal affairs of the Arabian countries, actively using the UN and other international organizations for the purpose. The ABCP categorically condemns subservience to the United States of America in this illegal affair on the part of the compradore leadership of Russia.

Our position concerning the basic principles of settlement in the Near East here is distinct and clear. Proceeding from impermissibility of occupation of alien land by aggression, we consider that all the territories occupied by Israel, including Golan Heights, the west shore of River Jordan, Gaza Strip and the Lebanese land ought to be returned to the Arabians without delay. The inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and foundation of its own independent sovereign state ought to be ensured in practice. East Jerusalem ought to be returned to the Arabians and become the inalienable part of the Palestinian state. In all Jerusalem the free access of believers to the honored places of the three world religions ought to be ensured.

To achieve these just aims all the political and diplomatic possibilities including international conferences, efforts of the UN and Security Council and other organizations ought to be used to the end. For the purpose it is important to isolate the aggressors and their accomplices including Russian ones by forming, in the UN and generally on the international arena, the united front of action against the expansionist forces in the region. We are convinced that the just and progressive cause of the Arabian peoples will emerge victorious. Our sympathy and friendly sentiment were and are on the side of the peoples of the Arabian countries.

In conclusion I would like to stress that the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union carried out by the domestic and foreign forces of reaction is now the leading direction of the world struggle. The international character of bourgeois counterrevolution makes internationalization of the struggle with it necessary. In other words, this means enlistment in this struggle of international communist movement and all the progressive forces. The increased danger to peace and socialism pressingly requires the foundation of international organization of communists. Preparation for the foundation of such coordinated structure itself will be conducive to the consolidation of the progressive force, their class-social differentiation, decisive demarcation with opportunists and conciliators, rise in the activeness and militancy of the communist and workers' parties.

We do not doubt that socialism sooner or later will get rid of opportunist filth, overcome the crisis in its rise and reveal endless possibility of self-perfection. Objectively in the international working-class movement and socialism lies the possibility of guarding mankind from the military, economic, ecological, demographic, information and other global crises. Only socialism fully reflects human interests and results of creation of the masses of people. In this critical era history entrusted us, communists, with a mission to win the hearts of people and instil in them faith in social progress which is menaced by imperialism. Let us unite in the struggle with reaction. Our cause is just. The future belongs to socialism and communism. Our duty is to bring earlier its victory. Reaction is doomed to defeat. Victory is in store for us.

August 1992,
Damask City

(Published for the first time.)

* * *

STRENGTH OF COMMUNISTS LIES IN THEIR UNITY AND IRRECONCILABILITY TO OPPORTUNISM

Respected comrades, the 20th century full of events is drawing to its close. The era of endless wars and revolutions, the era of the great October and victory of peoples in the gigantic battle with fascism. The era of flight of man into cosmos and collapse of colonial system, the era of transnational monopolies and global protracted bondage of peoples of whole continents. The era which opened the working people the way out of the gravest crisis engendered by imperialism, the era marking the revolutionary beginning of solution of the world antagonism between the oppressed and the oppressors. The 20th century meant and ensured emergence on the world arena of the independent historical creation of the international working class which was able to win allies to its side and create the system of socialist states, the socio-economic system, which, unfortunately, is in grave crisis on the eve of the 21th century due to the bourgeois counterrevolutionary coup in the USSR and European socialist countries.

The dynamism, tension and tragic character of events which took place in our country attracted keen attention of the world public. Honest people are accustomed to it that the bipolar structure of the postwar world was formed and stabilized. This bipolar and alternative system incited imperialist monopolies to competition in raising the living standards of population ensuring the stability of bourgeois structure. The broad sections of the working people in the developed capitalist states gained from this competition.

The socialist superpower which marked the strongpoint of peace and progress for long did much for the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, being bastion in the way of imperialist robbery and reaction. Now this bastion was destroyed considerably. It was not long before the consequences of this told everywhere.

If the Soviet Union, the socialist system of states and the Warsaw Pact had not been disrupted, had imperialism dared to organize genocide against the Iraqi people and violation of the sovereignty of Iraq for the benefit of the United States and Israel? Had NATO raised the axe of war over the heads of much-suffering peoples of Yugoslavia? Could the rabid campaign of discredit of socialist Cuba, and insult of her valiant people and heroic leadership headed by Fidel Castro have

taken place with impunity? The mortal cold of all-embracing military cataclysm drifted from many of these aggressive acts. Apparently the alignment of forces formed on the international arena will be fraught with aggravation of old and new capitalist contradictions the settlement of which already twice underwent world wars.

Why did destruction of the foundations of socialism and collapse of the multi-nationality USSR and the CPSU become possible? Today many ask this question. It was placed on the agenda in the international communist and working-class movement. Recently Comrade Gus Hall, national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, expressed his opinion concering this problem in the newspaper *Soviet Russia,* inviting all communists to discussion. "The main source of crisis in the socialist world and mainly in the former USSR was," in his words, "infection of the communist party by the virus of opportunism and fast spread of this infection. From where did it appear and why did it acquire the scale of epidemic? I suppose that in the first place it took place because of refusal of the system of ideological immunity which was secured by the Marxist-Leninist science. This immune deficiency developed during long period and with announcement of 'new thinking' the disease burst out like a fire."

The ABCP which was founded in November 1991 after self-dissolution of the CPSU and has inherited the traditions of Leininsm fully shares Gus Hall's conclusion that the main source and cause of temporary defeat of socialism in the USSR and Europe is opportunism which infected the heart of the CPSU in the post-Stalin period. The wavering of petty-bourgeois element in our country, enormous loss in the Great Patriotic War suffered by the working class and communists and pressure of international imperialism on socialist states, too, exerted influence on this deviation from the revolutionary ideology.

Gus Hall was quite right in saying that the crises in the USSR and in the CPSU infected with immunodeficiency disease began long ago but not toward the end of the '80s when the Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze-Yeltsin clique took the path of social treachery. The ABCP considers that shift of the CPSU to opportunism and revisionism began from the end of the '50s with the accession of Khrushchev and his company to the leadership of the Central Committee of the party.

The milestone of the degeneration of the CPSU was marked by the 20th Congress which shifted the basic stresses of political line to Right opportunism, the line which began and was accompanied with anti-Stalin campaign under the false slogan of criticism of "personality cult". The communists who disagreed with such position were dismissed from work and expelled from the CPSU and subjected to moral terrorism as "Stalinists". And they at times suffered repression under different pretexts.

Opportunism promoted to leadership became ruling and state opportunism, which, on the one hand, led to increase its danger for the fate of the country and, on the other hand, allowed opportunists to disorient communists and the Soviet people with the aid of powerful propaganda apparatus. Those who called themselves "faithful Leninists" and injured by the criticism of "Stalin's personality cult" did not notice how they mounted Khrushchev, Brezhnev and then Gorbachev on the pedestal of "cult", even not understanding how ridiculous they looked before the whole thinking world.

J.V. Stalin very accurately defined the social role of Right opportunism in the ruling party of the working class in time, stressing that for opportunists "socialism means rearing and enriching bourgeoisie." Inclusion of the elements of capitalist economy in the socialist economic system in the USSR promoted rearing and enrichment of the "shady" neo-bourgeoisie which corrupted all around it. It was followed by the depoliticization of the working people, removal of workers and peasants from the leadership of the state, expansion, bureaucratization and then corruption of the Soviet and party apparatuses.

The Marxist-Leninist science began to break away from social-political practice and the ideological edge of the revolutionary theory became blunted. This led to it that Marxism-Leninism ceased to be considered as the theoretical foundation and ensuring of the world-historic mission of the international working class and its allies the essence of which it is to create society free of exploitation, oppression, violence, wars and social injustice. In other words, opportunism gradually washed away the class and party foundation of the scientific proletarian world outlook which Marxism-Leninism was, beginning with the middle of the last century, and really is. The leadership of the CPSU failed to ensure development of the Marxist-Leninist theory in the light of the new reality and defend it from the attack of revisionism and bourgeois ideology.

Ideological immune deficiency together with the economic, social and political roots of opportunism allowed the latter to be firmly established in the CPSU and prepare Gorbachev's perestroika as restoration of capitalism covered up with socialist phraseology, the restoration which is the result of a whole complex of causes deserving all-round analysis. I fully agree with Comrade Kim Jong Il, the leader of the Workers' Party of Korea, who asserted in the beginning of this year that the revival of capitalism in European socialist countries and in the USSR "can never be regarded as an accidental phenomenon... and has been brought about only by external factors. ... Single concessions and gradual retreat from socialist principles have resulted in ten- and hundred-fold concessions and a full retreat until, finally, the grave consequence of the ruin of the working-class parties themselves was incurred."

It is natural that the state opportunism soon went over to the

open capitalization of socialism or revival of capitalism, throwing away pseudo socialist camouflage. This programmed the fate of the parties of the Second International for the CPSU. The processes of creeping depoliticization and deideologization made possible implantation in the consciousness of the Soviet people of such "masterpieces of theory" as the assertion about withering away of class struggle, conciliation of the "Red" and the "White", priority of values common to humanity and human rights over class values and obligations of citizen and that "the interests of nation are above all".

Further introduction of revisionist "masterpieces" and all the theoretical mediocrity of "new thinking" through the practice of Gorbachev's perestroika and Yeltsin's "grabstroika" (predatory perestroika) led our country to an unprecedented catastrophe. Winter is nearing but grain deliveries are actually not fulfilled. Fuel is not yet laid in for the winter and thermal power stations do not operate. 36 out of 59 blast furnaces in the country were put out of operation. All industry, agriculture, financial system, education and health services are paralyzed. Birth rate decreased by 85 per cent and death rate increased almost two times. Railway, water and air transport and all atomic power stations are on the verge of disruption. Millions of people are given forced unpaid leave and do not know that many of them will become unemployed. Much blood is shed in many regions of the hotbeds of inter-nationality conflicts. Nuclear attack of the potential imperialist aggressor hardly could cause more ravages to the country than bourgeois counterrevolution.

President Yeltsin and his government assert that "there is no way to retreat" and their "shock" treatment will soon begin to bear fruit....

The country more and more approaches abyss.

Gus Hall rightly asserted: "There is hardly found any other country in the contemporary world in which the President reduced his people to such impoverishment, destroyed the great state and wasted his armed forces with impunity as now in Russia and in the former Soviet republics." How is this unprecedented treachery now committed with impunity? Many now rack their brains over this as the Soviet communists whose party suffered temporary historic defeat. Unfortunately almost no one of the opponents of restorationists so far does strive to look into what the strength of the present regime lies in.

The communist press in our country willingly writes much about the crimes and lack of prospect for bourgeois counterrevolution. At times it becomes incomprehensible how Yeltsin's power holds out. We consider that it is useful to set to analyze the sources and causes of relative stability of the power of restorationists, though this stability is similar to the stability of gradual fall of this power.

Of course, any "stable" fall cannot continue for ever or even relatively long. Here it should not be allowed to threaten with civil

war, which petty bourgeois democrats like to do. You cannot threaten the power of restorationists with this. It is not opposed to such outcome, it will provide justifiable pretext for introduction of foreign "peace maintenance forces", which would imply conversion of the country into the geographical space with the status of colony. Now let us revert to the main, in our opinion, question of what are the sources of long "unsinkability" of the counterrevolutionary power which has brought the country to catastrophe?

First, this is the main thing. The present political regime relies on the powerful Mafia-like economic structure which Yeltsin allowed all. Now it is already forgotten that the main source of capital of Mafia in the USSR is the "shady" or underground capital the fight with which the CPSU, which became Right social democratic, lost ignominiously. The criminal neo-bourgeoisie legalized by the restorers of capitalism gradually overcame its "lack of political experience" and amassed several milliards of fortune in set months and weeks. Now the criminal business set to form monopoly association of which Borovoi, known stockbroker and banker, told on the TV screen.

Bank and stock-exchange capital goes ahead of others in the sphere of "integration". Uniting with foreign investors, they hurry to sell all that were yet not sold out in the long-suffering motherland. In reality these powerful Mafia-economic structures live on production, and squeeze the state-capitalist enterprises into which the all-people property of the Soviet state has already been converted.

It ought to be stressed that merger of capital with Mafia in the current period of development of the imperialist stage of capitalism is not exclusively Russian phenomenon. The present stage of crisis of world capitalism is characterized by the orientation of the criminal bourgeoisie, which grew rich, toward political power. Narcotic business, export of children as live containers "for spare parts" for conveyance of human organs for transplantation, more accelerated integration of national and transnational bank capital in comparison with industrial one and many others. This naturally resulted in that power in a number of states became involved in criminal acts. Particularly now together with Columbia and Afghanistan Mafia organizations, continuing the traditions of Somosa and Stressner, acceded to power in the "sovereign states" in the territory of the USSR. This imparts especially ominous character to the "wild" capitalism in our country and, at the same time, ensures relative stability of the counterrevolutionary power.

Our "wild" capitalism would not hold out even for a month, if it were not fed with the monetary injection and "humanitarian aid" of international capital. The main directions of the foreign policy of the Yeltsin-Kozyrev government are not only the overall sale of national wealth but also efforts designed to receive large amount of aid from foreign capital. Such shameless extortion which may drag on for

several decades according to the prediction of *The Washington Post* obtains understanding of the leaders of the Western countries. Recently in Munich the "big seven" and the International Monetary Fund offered Yeltsin 24 milliard dollars and allowed him to defer payment of interest on the former debt. President Bush, having thrown General Noriega into prison for life, delivers Russian Mafias hundreds of millions and milliards of dollars from the pockets of American taxpayers without the prick of conscience. He delivers them even without being sure that these debts would be cleared off one day.

What is the cause of such generosity and extravagance on the part of those who can count money well? Bush plainly understands that these credits and loans are now a mere trifle in comparison with more than five trillion dollars which the United States spent for the "check of communism" and overthrow of socialism in recent 70 years. Did Germany and other bourgeois countries spend less for this purpose whose rulers did not take away the plans of rout of the USSR and other socialist countries from their work tables after 1917?

Secondly, the highly organized Mafia organizations which joined the big business cannot function without the definite social environment and without some speculative-criminal plankton of lumpen petty-bourgeois marsh. Yeltsin's power permits the voracious and insatiable small fry consisting of small tradesmen, swindlers-cooperative officials, middlemen, speculators, prostitutes, racketeers and hired murderers and the like to do almost all that they want. As a result, secondhand markets emerged in beautiful squares and avenues of Soviet cities, lack of sanitation prevails, brawl and shooting break out and, narcotics and weapons are sold and bought and young people are corrupted.

If the upper crust of Mafia clans are inspired by the wind of "high politics" framed in the corridors of Yeltsin's White House, their roots are genetically and actually planted in the fetid criminal marsh which objectively is the pillar of the present regime. Therefore when some from the local authorities or judicial organs launch a struggle with this filth, they unexpectedly receive blows from above, from Mafia "angels". Political offenders "legally" protect economic offenders.

Counterrevolution brought the stench of venomous criminal marsh to the surface of social and political life. They are noisy, boisterous and content with themselves and with their recent new activity, and they are in front of everybody. They appear before TV camera, dangle about foreigners, curse communism and commit brutal outrages in inter-nationality conflicts. Such is infantry of bourgeois counterrevolution which firmly "tied" itself to the regime. It is needless to do political work among them and call them to rally "under the banner". This "environment" replenishes the ranks of "national

guards" and other armed units of bourgeoisie. They understand that if the genuine people's government assumes power, all that are stolen, grabbed and plundered from the working people will be taken away and returned to the genuine owners. Therefore, like the big business the criminal marsh resists and will resist such outcome.

The lumpen marsh which serves as the legalized base of potential fascistization of regime through the intensification of authoritarianism and nationalism presents the main danger for the working people and the progressive democratic forces. Here the "process went" a long way as Gorbachev likes to say. Particularly it did fast after introduction of presidency in the republics, its way being carpeted with innocent victims of Karabakh, Fergana, Osetia, Pridnestrovie, Abkhazia and other regions of the Soviet country, which prospered before, by the greedy nationalist bourgeoisie, which are now converted into the "hot spots of the globe".

From then on candidates for dictators at different levels are actively sought. Political parties are even founded under "promising" leaders. It is not excluded that the process of this search for "powerful hand" so far is somewhat checked by the bourgeois-democratic entourage of restoration which the "host of Presidents" cannot simply shake off, notwithstanding that the American press insistently recommends Yeltsin and Kravchuk to become "authoritarian nationalists". It seems to me that the above mentioned Presidents of Russia and Ukraine can hardly implement these recommendations and convert the country into the "authoritarian- nationalist paradise". Apparently here are needed other political forces, which are now being prepared to "enter the power" in the "sovereign states", above all, in the Russian republic, to save the bourgeois-restorative reformation which was brought to impasse.

The third and basic source and cause of "unsinkability" of the present regime is the deep echeloned political forces which counterrevolution relies on. Such is the internal factor of the relative stability of the restoration process in the USSR. Strengthening it, the internal and external reaction apparently used all the experience of struggle with the socialist system of states which was generalized by the Sovietologists and refugee anti-Soviets-dissidents.

At the present the conditions for the next realignment of forces in the ruling class are maturing. The compradore, pro-Western and cosmopolitanizing bourgeoisie which compromised itself definitely is gradually being removed from the leadership. It is driven out to weaken the resistance of the working people. On the foreground vigorously appears national capital, which lays up its intellectual reserves, organizes political parties and movements, occupies key positions in the organs of power and management. The strength of national bourgeoisie lies in the state-patriotic principle, which is now particularly attractive for citizens including servicemen who are worried about the collapse of the great power and its armed froces.

The ideological foundation of national bourgeoisie is nationalism and mass foundation is the petty-bourgeois strata in town and country who gravitate to patriotic organizations. An alliance with national capital is made by the "party-nomenclatural" capital of the CPSU, which, having undertaken search for the "money of the CPSU" under Yeltsin's regime, is not so confident in itself. The struggle for the influence over directors of tens of thousands of enterprises is being fought between compradores and "national patriots". Striving to enlist the latter to his reforms, Yeltsin raised the monthly salary of directors up to 100,000-150,000 roubles, which completely correspond to the income of middle entrepreneurs.

The coordinating and leading centre of the bourgeois-patriotic opposition is the Russian National Council, which conducts different "fronts" and "committees". The council is led by Aksyuchits, businessman-stockbroker, Zyuganov, secretary of the former Russian Communist Party, Sterling, general-traitor of the State Security Commission, "defender of the White House". They look meaningful against the background of Blackshirts with modernized swastika on the armband and pre-revolutionary General shoulder-straps and tsar's decorations of Cossack atamans. Unlike communists-Bolsheviks ideologues of national patriots are often carried on the pages of *Pravda, Soviet Russia* and other press of the former CPSU.

The political orientation of the present national bourgeois bloc testifies to it that it is for private property and guarantee against "any attempt of restoration of communist regime". As for the adherents on the present compradore regime, they ought "honestly to recognize their fault" before the fellow countrymen, after which the "inviolability of person and lack of infringement on civil and political rights will be guaranteed" for them. After accession to power the Russian Council intends to form provisional coalition government of "national conciliation", in which the "clean democrats" and "nationally orientated communists" will cooperate under the leadership of national patriots.

The first task of coalition is to secure "social peace" between national undertaking and the working people. Thus there is no need for the restorationists of capitalism and their sponsors to be uneasy. All the "nationally orientated" are potential ally of the present regime which diverts considerable part of the opposition forces from the real struggle with them. They hold the position of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, ready to adopt "special measures". It is not fortuitous that national patriots declared Admiral Kolchak, General Kornilov, Baron Wingern and other executioners of the period of civil war in Russia to be their heroes and models for emulation. These "White heroes" knew how to treat communists and those who rose in revolt against the oppressors of people.

Unfortunately, today many Soviet people, while rightly supporting the sharp criticism of national patriots on the government of

compradores, do not consider the class essence of their position and not see difference between the affected pseudo-patriotism of national bourgeoisie and the socialist patriotism of the working people. To help people see this difference as early as possible is the obligation of communists and the guarantee of success in their genuinely patriotic activity. In this connection, proceeding from the position of Soviet patriotism, the ABCP is opposed to the participation of communists in any counterrevolutionary governments under any banner.

In our opinion, however paradoxical it may be, the camouflaged potential ally of Yeltsin's regime is now the opportunist party bureaucracy of the former CPSU nursed by the anti-Stalin demagoguery. Today on the ruins of the party founded by Lenin and betrayed by Judas-Gorbachev sprang up not only tens of parties of social-democratic and Menshevik types but also those which advocate malignant anti-communism. Such is one of most important results of opportunist degeneration and disintegration of the CPSU.

In the recent three decades the CPSU converted into the settling basin for social-democrats, anti-communists, nationalists, cosmopolitans, anarchists and monarchists. Considerable part of the former party leadership from the secretaries of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the instructors of district committees rushed into business. The body of people's deputies more than 70 per cent of which were members of the CPSU voted for anti-constitutional acts of bourgeois counterrevolution at the congresses. With wonderful swiftness were changed the editorial staffs of *Pravda* and other party publications, teachers of Marxist-Leninist principles, the active propagandists-lecturers of party committees. The party was actually not broken up but dissolved itself. The party bureaucrats did not seek support from people but rather feared them. Hence it is small wonder that now the activity of the former party dignitaries are often correlated with the line of Yeltsin's state bureaucracy the ranks of which they replenished.

Aggravation of the crisis of restoration of capitalism in the USSR activated many party bureaucrats, above all, those of them who acceded to the leadership in the period of Gorbachev's perestroika. This activation particularly led to the attempt to reanimate the CPSU through the convocation of the 29th Congress, return all the confiscated through the repeal by the Constitutional Court of Yeltsin's illegitimate decrees on the ban of activity of the party and also through promotion of their protege to the post of Russian President. The initiative here was taken by the Socialist Party of the Working People, the Union of Communists and a number of other parties which arose on the basis of the former so-called "democratic" and "Marxist" platforms in the CPSU.

Recently was held the first 29th Congress convened by some "organizational committees" which represented no one. Next month there will be held the second such and, apparently, not the last of a

Fourthly, this is perhaps most complicated and important. It is necessary to set to practical work to overcome crisis and restore unity of the international communist movement on the Marxist-Leninist basis. This, in our opinion, ought to be connected with creating the international coordinating structure, international press and theoretic organs as the base of mutual exchange of information and experience. In the contemporary conditions these structures could use the revolutionary traditions of the Communist International which played main role in the formation of the world communist movement.

As is known, struggle for socialism is, at the same time, national and international cause of the working class and its allies. Therefore, naturally out of the question is the some "command centre" in relation to which the parties of communists which are independent in their policy and responsible for the struggle in their country would be converted into its "national section".

What to begin with? The ABCP supports Gus Hall's proposal that restoration and strengthening of unity of the international communist and working-class movement can be started with convocation of the world conference of communist parties which could give collective assessment of the causes of crisis and draw lessons from temporary defeat of socialism in the USSR and Europe. At the conference the problem of founding the international coordination structure could be discussed. This problem now ought to become the subject of direct discussion within the party and in the international negotiations of communists. In other words, it is necessary to begin with thorough and energetic preparation for this conference.

In our opinion, it would be necessary to specify beforehand the composition of the participants in the world conference lest it should be converted into the arena of unproductive wrangle between social democratic-turned communists and Marxists-Leninists. With all diversity of communist movement, in our opinion, the parties holding fast to the position of Marxism-Leninism could be invited to take part in the conference. In other words, the parties which proceed in their activity from recognition of the world-historic mission of the working class and its allies, assumption of power by the proletariat as the point of departure for socialist transformation and the necessity of decisive struggle with bourgeois ideology, opportunism and revisionism.

We are convinced that it will not be so long before the international communist movement and socialism overcome crisis, repulse the all-round offensive of imperialist reaction and regroup their forces and make fresh advances in the revolutionary and creative activity of the masses of people. However wild reaction may run, the objective laws work for socialism and communism. Its inexorable march may be checked but cannot be stopped. The historical obligation of communists is to clear obstruction laid by anti-communism

and opportunism in the way of social progress. Our strength lies in the fidelity to Marxism-Leninism and in international unity which is not imposed or asked. It is developed in the common struggle for the basic interests of the working people and peace in the world.

Let us put an end to opportunism and capitulationism in communist movement!

Let us defeat restorationists of capitalism!

Down with oppressors and parasites! Let us stop reaction and fascism!

All the power to the working people in town and country!

Let us uphold the banner of communist renovation of the world!

Our cause is just and fair!

Comrades in the common struggle, let us rally our ranks!

Workers and exploited people of the world, unite!

St. Paul, Brazil
September 1992

(Published for the first time)

* * *

THE CAUSE OF SOCIALISM IS INVINCIBLE

A Lecture Delivered before the Teachers and Students of Kim Il Sung University, October 6, 1992

Dear comrades and friends,

Creators-builders and heroic defenders of socialism in Korea,

Esteemed colleagues, the teachers and scientists of Kim Il Sung University,.

Allow me to greet you heartily in the name of the ABCP which has emerged on the ruins of the CPSU and on behalf of the Soviet people who have not surrendered in face of the treachery of the clique of Gorbachev and the ensuing tragic events of the ruin of the country, and also in the name of those who are fighting persistently for the restoration of the Soviet Union and socialism. I would also like to congratulate you on the 47th anniversary of the foundation of the Workers' Party of Korea, a significant holiday which is near at hand and wish you fresh successes in the building of socialism under the wise guidance of Comrade Kim Il Sung, the great leader, General Secretary, President and Generalissimo, and Comrade Kim Jong Il, the dear leader, Member of the Presidium of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party, Supreme Commander and Marshal—the outstanding figures of the international communist and working-class movement of the present time.

Many of you sitting in this hall may ask: why am I here in front

Their leadership is now obliged to sharply change political orientation. Influence of the United States and other leading capitalist countries on the "third" world grew. President Bush impudently declared that Near East and other regions many thousand kilometres distant from America are the zones of "vital interests for the United States". Owing to the complicity of the compradore government of Russia the imperialists applied hostile sanctions against people of a number of Arabian states without hindrance and Sandinists in Nicaragua were removed from power.

The temporary defeat of socialism in the USSR and Europe made the centre of world socialism and revolutionary movement shift to the Asian and Latin-American countries. The process of shift of epicentre of revolutionary transformation from the West to the East, as it seems to us, has not chance but law-governed character.

It would be a great simplification to explain the shift of the centre of world revolutionary movement from the West Europe to tsarist Russia on the confines of the 20th century and now to the Asian and Latin-American countries only with subjective causes the essence of which is the opportunist degeneration of the proletarian parties.

Undoubtedly, like the traitorous Gorbachev clique the "leaders" of the Second International played their pernicious role, betraying the working class and the working people. Class collaborators—"Marxist orthodoxes" and "faithful Leninists"—helped them. Thus, the "faithful Leninists" on Gorbachev's Central Committee of the CPSU practically supported the restorationist course with their position of class collaboration for the sake of "maintenance of peace and unity of the party". This formed a link between the policy of capital and the policy of the party which is called Leninist.

However, at the basis of the both shifts of the centre of revolutionary movement from the West to the East lay not subjective causes but deeper global changes in capitalism and new conditions connected with them which were created in the communist and world working-class movement.

Above all, shift in the worldwide struggle between labour and capital took and is taking place in the period of relative stabilization of capitalism. Today it is taking place in the conditions of further integration of transmonopoly capital. The situation of stabilization itself engenders in social consciousness what Lenin called "parliamentary cretinism", which withdrew the question of non-parliamentary forms of class struggle of the exploited.

Further, the logic itself of development of class struggle led to it that the national ranks of the working class and its allies, being in the vanguard, were subjected to particularly strong and crafty attacks on the part of capitalist system. Objectively this could not help but weaken their parties the leadership of which often lost orientation and communist prospect, gradually giving up the position

of scientific-proletarian ideology. Thus, in the European countries building socialism the leadership, unable to overcome the difficulties of revolutionary transformation, slid down to opportunism, conducing to the restorationists of capitalism.

Finally, the centre of the world revolutionary movement shifted and is shifting to the regions where social contradictions are more acute and where the situation requires radical solution of class antagonisms. Towards the beginning of the 20th century such region of social storms was the tsarist Russia and now is the Asian and Latin-American countries. The working class and its parties in these continents apparently have to make decisive contribution to the struggle of mankind with exploitation and oppression and pave new way for socialism and communism.

In conclusion it ought to be mentioned that the present change of balance of forces in favour of imperialism and reaction requires communists to change strategy and tactics of struggle. It is necessary to draw and put forward for discussion the conclusions deriving from the created situation. Let me dwell on some of them.

First, the main danger for the international communist movement now is Right opportunism which eventually tries to subordinate this movement to monopoly capital. Without defeating Right opportunism communist parties cannot get out of crisis, nor fulfil their obligation before the working class and the working people nor join the common stream of the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses of people.

One of most crafty forms of opportunism now is anti-Stalinism which plays the role of a Trojan Horse in communist movement. Without overcoming it the world revolutionary process cannot get out of crisis.

Secondly, the struggle with restorationists of capitalism in the USSR and European countries has international significance, as the October Revolution in Russia, victory of socialist revolution in China and establishment of socialist system of states did in their time. Placed on the list of priorities now is internationalization of this struggle with restorationism, brotherly aid and support to it on the part of communist parties the world over.

Thirdly, the world communist movement ought to render all-round assistance to the countries which are building socialism or have opted for socialist path. This requires respect and understanding of national specific features of these countries, decisive rejection of superficial and Europe-centred assessment of their historical specific features and opportunistic accusation of "feudal socialism" and other "absurdities." On the other hand, it increases responsibility of the socialist countries which withstood the onslaught of imperialism for the fate of the world communist and working-class movement and for the creative development of the revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

Fourthly, this is perhaps most complicated and important. It is necessary to set to practical work to overcome crisis and restore unity of the international communist movement on the Marxist-Leninist basis. This, in our opinion, ought to be connected with creating the international coordinating structure, international press and theoretic organs as the base of mutual exchange of information and experience. In the contemporary conditions these structures could use the revolutionary traditions of the Communist International which played main role in the formation of the world communist movement.

As is known, struggle for socialism is, at the same time, national and international cause of the working class and its allies. Therefore, naturally out of the question is the some "command centre" in relation to which the parties of communists which are independent in their policy and responsible for the struggle in their country would be converted into its "national section".

What to begin with? The ABCP supports Gus Hall's proposal that restoration and strengthening of unity of the international communist and working-class movement can be started with convocation of the world conference of communist parties which could give collective assessment of the causes of crisis and draw lessons from temporary defeat of socialism in the USSR and Europe. At the conference the problem of founding the international coordination structure could be discussed. This problem now ought to become the subject of direct discussion within the party and in the international negotiations of communists. In other words, it is necessary to begin with thorough and energetic preparation for this conference.

In our opinion, it would be necessary to specify beforehand the composition of the participants in the world conference lest it should be converted into the arena of unproductive wrangle between social democratic-turned communists and Marxists-Leninists. With all diversity of communist movement, in our opinion, the parties holding fast to the position of Marxism-Leninism could be invited to take part in the conference. In other words, the parties which proceed in their activity from recognition of the world-historic mission of the working class and its allies, assumption of power by the proletariat as the point of departure for socialist transformation and the necessity of decisive struggle with bourgeois ideology, opportunism and revisionism.

We are convinced that it will not be so long before the international communist movement and socialism overcome crisis, repulse the all-round offensive of imperialist reaction and regroup their forces and make fresh advances in the revolutionary and creative activity of the masses of people. However wild reaction may run, the objective laws work for socialism and communism. Its inexorable march may be checked but cannot be stopped. The historical obligation of communists is to clear obstruction laid by anti-communism

and opportunism in the way of social progress. Our strength lies in the fidelity to Marxism-Leninism and in international unity which is not imposed or asked. It is developed in the common struggle for the basic interests of the working people and peace in the world.

Let us put an end to opportunism and capitulationism in communist movement!

Let us defeat restorationists of capitalism!

Down with oppressors and parasites! Let us stop reaction and fascism!

All the power to the working people in town and country!

Let us uphold the banner of communist renovation of the world!

Our cause is just and fair!

Comrades in the common struggle, let us rally our ranks!

Workers and exploited people of the world, unite!

St. Paul, Brazil
September 1992

(Published for the first time)

* * *

THE CAUSE OF SOCIALISM IS INVINCIBLE

A Lecture Delivered before the Teachers and Students of Kim Il Sung University, October 6, 1992

Dear comrades and friends,

Creators-builders and heroic defenders of socialism in Korea,

Esteemed colleagues, the teachers and scientists of Kim Il Sung University,.

Allow me to greet you heartily in the name of the ABCP which has emerged on the ruins of the CPSU and on behalf of the Soviet people who have not surrendered in face of the treachery of the clique of Gorbachev and the ensuing tragic events of the ruin of the country, and also in the name of those who are fighting persistently for the restoration of the Soviet Union and socialism. I would also like to congratulate you on the 47th anniversary of the foundation of the Workers' Party of Korea, a significant holiday which is near at hand and wish you fresh successes in the building of socialism under the wise guidance of Comrade Kim Il Sung, the great leader, General Secretary, President and Generalissimo, and Comrade Kim Jong Il, the dear leader, Member of the Presidium of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party, Supreme Commander and Marshal—the outstanding figures of the international communist and working-class movement of the present time.

Many of you sitting in this hall may ask: why am I here in front

of you, what can I say to you, the builders of socialism in Korea, whom the present era has put in the vanguard of social progress in the struggle against imperialism? During the past half a year we have been to Belgium, Germany, Greece, the Near East and Brazil, held talks and conversed with the heads of scores of political parties, communists and social democrats, metallurgists and coal miners, engineers and doctors, professors and scientists, artists and directors, writers and outstanding figures of the world culture, members of the Upper House and congressmen, statesmen and mayors, pressmen and diplomats; we made speeches over TV and radio and published article in many newspapers and journals.

Today there are few people whom the following questions do not worry; what has happened in the Soviet Union, how was it possible that the working people gave up their power without battle, why was the CPSU founded by Lenin dissolved by itself, what will now be the destiny of world socialism and the international communist movement, how long can the offensive of reaction last in our country? These questions are also argued among the Korean comrades. In particular, the distinguished views with regard to these questions which were clarified by the dear leader Comrade Kim Jong Il in his historic talk with the senior officials of the CC of the Workers' Party of Korea on January 3, 1992 are widely known throughout the world. Needless to say, all of you are acquainted well with these views and the wise conclusions which have been derived from them. Our party totally agrees with them. Now, let me refer to the questions that have been raised.

What happened in the USSR in recent years? Sad as it is to admit this, but in the Soviet Union there took place bourgeois counterrevolution which started by turning socialism into capitalism, that is, the introduction of the elements of capitalism into socialism, which later turned over to the restoration of capitalist relations in all spheres of social life.

What are the sources and reasons of this retreat of the movement, of the retrogression of socialism in the USSR and the European socialist countries? It is nobody's secret that the internal and external policy of the USSR was mapped out and guided by the CPSU. Unlike feudalism and capitalism the building and development of socialism cannot assume spontaneous character. The formation of socialist relations must be planned and organized and rely on a constantly developing scientific base. It is the working-class party that should give organized, planned and scientific character to socialism.

The might of the revolutionary working-class party lies in having a scientific programme, consistently defending the social interests of the working people and in having a correct understanding of how to achieve the strategic goals of the working class deriving from these

interests. For the party founded by Lenin these interests were at first the interests of the working class, kolkhoz-sovkhoz peasantry and working intellectuals. All manner of retreat from these interests meant and means socio-political betrayal—concession of the communist position to the class enemy.

When did this concession of the scientific-proletarian positions take place in the building of socialism in the Soviet Union? In some communist parties and in our country it is usually considered that everything started with the seizure of hegemony by Gorbachev and his intimates. Today the unsatisfactoriness of such an appraisal is evident. It cannot give the answer to the question, why was it suddenly possible for the foundations of socialism to be destroyed, for the USSR, a multinational state, to be disorganized and for the CPSU to be liquidated. It is impossible for a few renegades and betrayers, however high their position may be, to destroy, only in several years, a politically ripe party and sound socio-economic system. In other words, protracted preparations of counterrevolution were needed both within the country and outside it. Above all, the degeneration of the ruling party, its opportunist deterioration was needed.

The ABCP regards that the degradation of the CPSU into Right opportunism and revisionism started from the end of the'50s when the leadership of the party and state was seized by Khrushchev and his associates. The starting point of the degeneration of the CPSU into opportunism was its 20th Congress. The ideological prelude, ideological premise here was the anti-Stalin campaign which was launched under the false slogan of the criticism of the "cult of personality". The unlimited prestige of J. V. Stalin was treacherously proclaimed to the whole world as the "cult of personality" and the "disclosure" itself assumed nasty petty-bourgeois and philistine character. As a matter of fact, soon it was clarified that most of the blame was the device of Khrushchev and somebody else, but the propaganda machine of "disclosure" was already put into motion in full swing. Those communists who opposed such policy were released from office, excluded from the CPSU and exposed to moral terror as "Stalinists". Sometimes they were suppressed under various fictitious pretexts.

The great leader Comrade Kim Il Sung rightly says that the driving force of the revolution and socialist construction is "none other than the unity of the leader, party and the masses". It is no accident that opportunist Khrushchev dealt his first blows to such unity with a view to disorganizing and weakening the motive force of socialist reforms. In this way the building of socialism was suspended and the international working-class and communist movement as well as the national liberation struggle of the people against imperialism suffered a severe loss. The anti-Stalin campaign led to the impair of the prestige of socialism, to the confrontation with the Communist

Party of China and, afterward, to the clashes on the border of the USSR and China, which is something shameful for our leadership, and to the activation of the enemies of socialism in the People's Democracies of Europe. In the Soviet Union there took place mass replacement of party and government cadres and impairment of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism as the scientific world outlook of the working class as well as of the socialist forces of the present time was started.

History proves that the danger of opportunism increases several times more when it becomes ruling and nationwide because under socialism a powerful propaganda apparatus, which is capable of making the communists and working people lose direction for a long time, comes to its service. Precisely this happened in the Soviet Union. In his time J.V. Stalin defined very correctly the social role of Right opportunism by stressing that for opportunists "socialism means raising and enriching bourgeoisie." Opportunism is expressed in unprincipledness, in the shortsighted pursuit of immediate individual interests, which are frequently imaginary, that run counter to the fundamental interests of the working people. At first the harm of such a policy was disguised and was partly compensated by the real achievements of socialism in the past, the achievements which created an unprecedented reserve of the stability of the socialist system.

If in the time of Stalin the basic aim of the economy was the reduction of the cost of goods (the main item of the plan of each enterprise) and the production of high-quality goods by making use of scientific achievements and new techniques and economizing in the raw materials, power and labour force, then at the time of Khrushchev and Brezhnev the main index of the economic effectiveness of production was the gaining of the profit in monetary expression. They started to achieve this through the method of artificially raising prices, that is to say, an utterly unreasonable method which allows the reduction of the amount of the produced goods while increasing the prices. Shortsighted pursuit of the profits and other private interests for the enterprise led to the retard of the rate of the development of the national economy, decrease of the effectiveness of investment and gradual lowering of the value of the rouble. Planned reduction of the prices was suspended and the increase of the prices of consumer goods started and cheap goods disappeared. Scientific and technical progress is hindered and labour productivity decreases.

The opportunist economic policy resulted in a great gap between those who receive high wages and low wages. The rate exceeded 1 to 30 and it now exceeds 1 to 150. The "black" economy which produces the elements of private enterprises is developing. The unlawful accumulation of capital by the new "Soviet" bourgeoisie began to appear. The new bourgeoisie who are getting rich gradually

destroyed everything around them. The "black" economic entrepreneurs and the bribed bureaucrats of the party and government organs are conspiring with each other. The process of class distinctions disappearing is made by social division and the division into the rich and the poor in society. Under this condition, moral incentives to labour disappeared among the working people while a negative attitude towards every state property appeared. The violation of labour discipline and the practices of squandering the people's property are increasing. The Soviet state is losing its class character. The Soviet state is changing from the state of proletarian dictatorship to an "all-people state".

In this state bureaucracy, bribe and corruption are prevalent. Around the 80s the state structures increased three times over those of the Stalin period. Efficiency of the state instrument is decreasing. The state is getting away from the working people, as it is said, it is separating from them. As a result, the social basis of the Soviet state has been crumbled, the Soviet state lost the support of the working people and the struggle against crimes which gradually paralyse the function of society weakened. Through the so-called "all-people state" the people became to be imbued with the idea of the so-called comprehensive equality and "pure" democracy. This bourgeois concept is covering in principle the impossibility of equality between the exploiter and the exploited, between the oppressor and the oppressed.

With the seizure of leadership by Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze group, Rightist opportunism went over to restoring capitalism on a legal basis. Starting from the Khrushchev's concept of "complete and final victory of socialism in the Soviet Union" and through the Brezhnev's false propaganda of "developed socialism", the upper stratum of the CPSU has transformed itself completely and finally into a betrayer, a renegade, a cat's paw of the US monopoly capital and its criminal bourgeoisie, a devastator of socialism and the multi-national Soviet state and a disorganizer of the party; as a result the Rightist opportunism has finished its evolution. The opportunists in the party leadership including Gorbachev, Yakovlev, Yeltsin, Kravchuk and Nazerbayev who were singing *Internationale* in front of the TV camera some days ago are clamouring today "the downfall of socialism", "the historic dead end" and "a failed experiment"; in this way they are revealing their complete political and moral bankruptcy.

In addition to this, we must take three aspects into consideration.

First, with a view that the frustration of socialism in the Soviet Union was not spontaneous, it is totally wrong to regard that counterrevolution had finally and completely emerged victorious. As the dear leader Comrade Kim Jong Il rightly pointed out in his work *The Historical Lesson in Building Socialism and the General Line of Our Party,* which contains profound theories, "the frustration of

socialism and the revival of capitalism in some countries, when viewed in the light of the main tide of historical development, is only a temporary, local phenomenon". No matter what the machinations of the reactionaries may be, the general current of history will inevitably flow through feudalism and capitalism to socialism and sweep away the fortress of imperialism. This current might be checked for a while and face obstacles. But no one can reverse the wheel of history, neither counterrevolution nor war nor betrayal can reverse it.

Secondly, strictly speaking, it is not socialism and the communist idea, but insignificant and incompetent opportunism, which had snatched power by hypocritical means, that has suffered defeat in the USSR.

Political double-dealers and careerists devoid of any ideas, who won the people's confidence by fraud and chameleon adaptation, have entrenched themselves in the top hierarchy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Today, they, in order to remain perched on the people's neck, are ready to depend on whatever scum of the earth—criminals, outcasts and even fascists, the inveterate enemy of mankind. They are behaving diplomatically even towards anti-Soviet exiles, and grovelling at the feet of the racists of South Africa and Israel, the reactionary Seoul and Taiwan regimes.

Therefore, it can be clearly said that it is not the party of communists that has ceased to exist, but its moribund, rotten and paralyzed structure born of opportunism that has proved incompetent and suffered disaster. The opportunists have long since ceased to embody the Leninist party, but are objectively opposed to it. In this connection, the ABCP is against the revival of the CPSU which has become a party of Right-wing socialists, for its opportunist leadership to be set up through its revival would restore nothing but opportunism.

Thirdly, capitalism which has now been saved by the renegades and opportunists can solve no problem of humanity. The collapse of imperialism may be delayed but cannot be removed from the day's order. Its present "triumph" is illusionary and involves the seeds of a deeper crisis, the aggravation of all worldwide contradictions, and of a sharpening struggle for redivision of the world. And, what is most important, Iraq, Yugoslavia and other projects for a third world war are being taken up and put into effect by the imperialists.

Socialism, therefore, provides the only chance of saving all the people on the earth from military, ecological, economic, demographic, informational and other global crises; for, today, it is not capitalism, but socialism that represents in the fullest scope the interests of all humanity, of which Bush and Gorbachev are fond of talking. The process of restoration of capitalism in European socialist countries and in the Soviet Union not only has been contrary to the objective law of historical progress, but also is arresting the struggle for

human survival. Therefore, this process of retrogression must be stopped. Counterrevolution is doomed to failure.

Where has the counterrevolution brought the Soviet people to? In short, it has brought them to a catastrophe of which there is no way out in the way to capitalism's revival which itself is in a serious crisis. This crisis now finds expression in its direct destruction of the productive forces. The uniquely integral production complex of the country has been destroyed. More than one thousand enterprises are closed down every month. The production level dropped to that of the early 1970s or the level of 20 years ago. Out of 58 large blast furnaces, 36 have put out the fire in their grates, valuable equipment is being destroyed and lost, rare supplies of raw materials stolen, coal-mines inundated, crop rotation made impossible, farm animals being butchered because of the shortage of feed, the means of transport that had been worn-out during Gorbastroika stopping to work, national defence complex pulled down. The failure in the procurement of farm products and fuel is threatening the danger of a cold and starving winter. The currency system finds itself in a crisis. In other words, the major tools and means of production and the material, technical basis of society are in a serious crisis and in a state of destruction. On the other hand, the most serious crisis has engulfed the working people, the cardinal component of productive forces and the creators of material and mental wealth. Unemployment has begun to increase quickly. During the "perestroika" the working-class has become non-political and ceased to be a class. The Yeltsin government has bankrupted kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The farm management has become the object of class hatred and is becoming insolvent. The growing inflation has lowered the value of rouble to 1 per cent, and this deprived the Soviet people of all their savings from labour. Wages are in arrears for many months. The country's reserves of gold and strategic materials have been depleted. Pensioners are on a below-poverty level or outside the range of biological survival or on the verge of starvation. By organizing genocide, the counterrevolutionaries are taking revenge on the previous generation which had built and defended socialism. The former party officials have lost their good party pensions. Because their wage scale was low in former days, they are now in very difficult material conditions in the light of general labour pensions. In Baltic states—Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia—those who participated, and who were disabled, in the Great Patriotic War have lost their pensions. Instead, the national bourgeoisie that has come to power, has granted high pensions to those who fought the Red Army in the war, who shot at the backs of the fighting people, who mocked at the people in the occupied area, also to those who, hiding in forests after the war, raided and plundered villages, and murdered true communists and Young Communist Leaguers and raped women. This scum of the earth calls the traitors "the defenders of the country", granting them

high pensions, and in addition, "redeeming" their prison terms for their crimes against the Soviet government.

Similar things are taking place also in Ukraine, Moldavia, and Russia. In many cases, the war veterans, whose services provided our life at present, are humiliated not only in words but also physically.

Some time ago in Minsk the counterrevolutionaries crippled Osipova, a woman partisan and heroine of the Soviet Union. During the war, she, by the order of the underground organization executed Kube, Hitler's agent and hangman of Belorussian people in the occupied area. She had thrown a bomb in his bedroom and sent him to hell. Those who robbed her of her war decorations and personal possessions can hardly be believed to be minor criminals. The recent incident in Minsk would have been impossible without the involvement of Belorussian nationalists. Chernovil, one of those who covet Ukrainian presidency, is the son of a SS agent. It is no accident that he has set up a grand monument on a hill near Livov in memory of Hitler's SS division to which many Ukrainian nationalists had belonged. Similar monuments have been set up by nationalists in other places, particularly in the Baltic States. Meanwhile, the monuments to heroic partisans, underground fighters and heroic soldiers are being pulled down. Recently a man who had served with renegade General Vlasov, and had been in hiding appeared on our TV screen. He, together with Vlasov who went over to Hitler's army, served the enemy. The renegade is now requesting military pensions from the present German government. In reply to journalists' question, he shamelessly claimed that he, with Vlasov, had fought against the Red Army during the war under the three-coloured flag, similar to the one now made the national flag of Russia by Yeltsin. The yellow-black flag under which the Ukrainian White rebels fought the Red Army during the civil war has now become the national flag of Ukraine. Under this yellow-black flag the Benderov and Ukrainian nationalists served Hitler during the Patriotic War, and later the Americans.

Intellectuals who had been held in hostage by the counterrevolutionaries have departed from the orbit of creative work. The "pedigree" intellectuals, elite, who prepared for the comeback of capitalism have suffered defeat. Not intellectuals, but the predatory entrepreneurs and upper crust who had been bribed by Yeltsin and had fattened on the blood of the people have now become millionaires and billionaires. Some time ago a "yellow" publication carried a fleeting news that in Moscow today the Mafia is ruling the city. In the capital and other cities gunshots are heard frequently. The Mafia men are settling their account with each other or exchanging fire with the police. Among the representatives of elite culture can be heard a groan of embarrassment, nostalgia of their fatherland and the past and yearning for even deformed socialism and dwindling stabil-

ity, security and order. Revived capitalism has brought about mental poverty in the country. In recent years not a worthy book, not a film worth mentioning, not a memorable musical piece has been on the topic. Theatres, film productions, art, and architectural art are in a state of crumbling. The public at large cannot afford to buy tickets for museums, theatres, cinemas, and exhibitions. American "mass culture" that preaches the possibility of violence, sexual irregularities and everything else is on the blatant offensive. TV, radio and other mass communications are gradually drifting away from the much-advertized "pluralism" and becoming official propaganda media of counterrevolution. Opposition to publications and TV is being put down by economic means. Working people have lost the last chance of expressing their views publicly against the creators of crises.

Science and scientists are in more deplorable conditions. Many scientists entered the world of corporation, enterprises and trade. The rest are living in misery. Many people began to wake at the sight of temples of science being destroyed, at the destruction of the traditions of Soviet science, the results of many generations of researches being robbed, the inventions and new technological developments, national pride, flowing out to the West at a low price. Yeltsin's state is losing the last position of the science of world standard, the position in which we were leading the world for decades. In order to earn a living in the capitalist market, the Academy of Sciences has instituted a department for recruiting scientists for export. "Brain trade" is conducted at the lowest price.

Conditions of the younger generation are tragic. Speculative businesses do not provide young people with stable and guaranteed means of money-making nor have they prospects. The new way of life brought about by revived capitalism has created mental cavity. Drugs, alcohol, prostitution, and other social evils are gradually killing more and more young people.

Graduates from universities, colleges, and technical schools have begun to add to unemployment which is growing monthly. Hunger has become the fate of university students. Subsidies are too low for them to eat lunches at campus cafeteria.

Universities and many secondary schools have begun to take fees. Some of them take monthly fees five to six times as much as the average wage in the country. As a result, education can be accessed only by the elite, or entrepreneurs, some of whom began to send their children to renowned universities in the United States and other Western countries.

The growth of mortality in all regions of the country is far exceeding the decreasing natality today. The number of suicides in the first six months of 1992 was as many as those who died in the war in Afghanistan over the past 10 years. Conflicts between nations caused by the national bourgeoisie are on the increase in number and

crimes are taking a heavy toll of lives. Normal activities of health organizations are being suspended although they are precious and indispensable to most of the working people. Many pioneers' camps, sightseeing bazars, kindergartens, nurseries, pioneers' halls and asylums for the aged closed their doors. The price of holiday and recuperation cards are too high for the working people to pay. But new-emerging capitalists are leaving in groups for most gorgeous sanatoria and homes for curative exercises. At this juncture an increasing number of mothers of poor families are obliged to leave their newborn babies behind in maternal hospitals owing to poverty. Relatives fail to hold funerals of the dead often, because the funeral expenses jumped up to 15,000 to 17,000 roubles (wages are 2,000 to 4,000 roubles). This is creating a painful atmosphere in society.

When was a political coup staged, the coup which pushed the Soviet people into a deep swamp of pain and misfortune? We consider that it took place after the August, 1991, event in Moscow, which was no "revolt", nor "state coup" nor "seizure of power", that is, after the formation of the so-called State Emergency Commission. Until then the revival of capitalism in the Soviet Union had been conducted under the guidance of the opportunist leadership body of the CPSU and had been camouflaged under the slogans, "socialist renovation" and the "acceleration of the speed of socialist development". In mid-1991 the counterrevolution was brought to perfection in such a form. A scenario was mapped out for the transition of the counterrevolution to its next stage. We think that it "was worked out abroad". In this anti-communist drama the role of producer was played by Gorbachev and Yeltsin and the role of actors was played by the pseudo democrats who were mobilized for the defence of the White House (Yeltsin's government building) and those young people devoid of class character who had surrounded the "barricade". The attempt could not be brought to a successful conclusion without a sacrificial offering which was necessary for the holding of a "ceremony". Thus the "three defenders" who had fallen a victim to this immolation were soon proclaimed to be the "Soviet Heroes" and a funeral was held with formality.

As the result of this provocation, the working people were deprived of their political power and the revival of capitalism was further promoted without any serious obstacles.

Owing to it, the army and the state security organizations lost their prestige and suffered a heavy blow. Immediately after that a purge in the army took place, beginning with those who had remained faithful to the oath to the Soviet state. Members of the State Emergency Commission Yanayev, Pavlov, Kryuchikov, Yazov, Shwenin and Starobychev and many other people were thrown into the prison bearing the name of "sailors' silence".

According to some information, Minister of Internal Affairs Pugo and some other leading officials of the CC of the CPSU committed suicide in very strange circumstances. Then began the collapse of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev who had returned from Faros (on the Crimea), set free from "detention", and Yeltsin prohibited the activities of the CPSU by issuing decrees. The peaceful collapse of party organizations started in the capital and local areas. There arises the following question. Why did no one express support for the CC of the CPSU and regional and city party committees?

The party founded by Lenin and educated by Stalin ended its existence long ago. The opportunists reduced the working-class party to a "party of all people".

In the recent 30 years the CPSU was converted into a "depositing basin", that is, a "storing ground" of the social democrats, anti-communists, nationalists, cosmopolitans, anarchists and despotists whom the Gorbachev-style restructuring had put on the stage of political activities.

A large number of those who had once held their positions in the former party leadership body set themselves up in business, ranging from the secretaries of the CC of the CPSU to the secretaries of the district party committees. There was not a single Politburo Member of the CPSU CC who could arouse the people to a struggle against the Right-wing opportunists who were gradually raising their heads. At the congresses the corps of people's deputies supported the unconstitutional acts of the bourgeois counterrevolution, although more than 70 per cent of its members were members of the Soviet Communist Party. The opportunists did not seek for any support from the people and party members nor did they call upon the people to defend the property and honour of the CPSU. The journalist group of *Pravda* and other party publications, teachers in charge of the Marxist-Leninist subject, propaganda lecturers of the party committees were "reformed" very quickly in Gorbachev style. In fact, the party was not dissolved by anyone but broke up itself! It was because only the signboard of the party remained communistic.

I am going to speak about the foreign policy, a direct extension of the internal and external policies of the state.

Lenin and Stalin said that we must not surrender under the pressure of the capitalist encirclement and that there might be the danger of nationalism gaining ground in a socialist country. This experience of theirs was not taken into consideration.

Our opportunists removed the class contents from the policy on peaceful coexistence. This has resulted in the weakening of socialist influence upon the Third World (the world of the developing countries) and the destruction of the international position of the world communist and working-class movement.

The road of degeneration and opportunism was that of the gradual weakening of the internationalist policy of socialism.

The opportunists made the Soviet people accustomed to the habit of regarding their country not as part of the integral whole of the

worldwide revolutionary process but as the beginning and the end of its process. In short, this meant that the interests of all other socialist countries and revolutionary parties should be sacrificed for the interests of the Soviet Union.

A bomb of domination and hegemony came to be put under the mutual relations of the socialist countries.

Owing to such a policy the socialist countries underwent trials and even unscrupulously did such things that got in the way of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which is building socialism adhering to an independent line confronted with imperialism, rather than helping her.

In addition, pseudo socialist hegemony and dominationism brought about the discontinuation of fraternal support for the national liberation forces and the abandonment of aid to the fraternal communist parties, the division of the world into the "sphere of influence" of the big powers and the collusion of the great powers sacrificing the interests of other nations.

Consequently the foreign policy of a socialist country came to lose its proletarian character and to assume the petty bourgeois character which resulted in the overall weakening of the socialist commonwealth. The nationalist tendency in the foreign policy gave rise to the disintegration and isolation of the socialist countries. The nationalist foreign policy encouraged by the opportunists became more pronounced by the restorationists of capitalism who had advocated chauvinism and animal egoism. To be mentioned here in particular was a provocative row they raised in connection with the "CPSU fund".

They are using those who seceded from the CPSU CC and from the State Security Commission.

The foreign policy of the Yeltsin government is completely subordinated to the interests of the US monopoly capital. That is why the government adopted a measure to finally put an end to the "pro-communist system" established in Serbia and Chernogoria and took the road of disparaging socialism in China, the DPRK, Viet Nam, Laos and Cuba and of working hand in glove with the imperialists who are opposed to the peace-loving people the world over.

The restorationists are making every possible effort to receive more aid from international capital, although the latter is displaying unprecedented generosity for the former.

The Gorbachev-led opportunist clique is responsible for the degeneration of the parties in the European socialist countries, for the activation of international capital which is launching attacks on the progressive forces everywhere and for the crisis created in the world communist movement. So the revival of capitalism in the Soviet Union should be regarded as the main factor in the international politics today. The struggle against the counterrevolution in the Soviet Union should assume an internationalist character. It is

necessary to draw all the progressive social forces in this struggle. International capital is fearful of international solidarity and hampers the strengthening of the anti-imperialist united front in every way.

A major task for strengthening this front rests on the shoulders of those parties which do not follow the opportunist resolution adopted at the 20th Congress of the CPSU. Out of these parties, I should like to mention, before anything else, the Workers' Party of Korea which has been setting the fine example of fortitude and proletarian internationalism over the past 47 years.

Owing to the temporary setback of socialism in Europe and the Soviet Union the centre of socialism and the revolutionary movement of the world has been shifted to those Asian and Latin American countries which are currently subjected to concentrated pressure by world capital.

At the beginning of the 20th century the centre of the world revolutionary movement moved from Germany to Russia. This enabled the party founded by Lenin to enhance the sense of responsibility for the world revolutionary cause. Today this centre has been shifted to Asia and Latin America. This makes it imperative to develop the sense of worldwide responsibility of Asian and Latin American countries for the destiny of world socialism, and that of the national-liberation movement of all the people and for the communist movement in the capitalist countries. We consider this a very lawful requirement.

The great exploit performed by the WPK, the great leader President Kim Il Sung and the dear leader Comrade Kim Jong Il is the mapping out of the Pyongyang Declaration. Its adoption means that the retreat of socialism on a worldwide scale has come to an end and the preparations for counterattack on imperialism and its realization have become the order of the day. This has brought about the beginning of solidarity of all the anti-imperialist forces led by the communist and other revolutionary parties. This is proved by the fact that 132 political parties have already signed the Pyongyang Declaration so far. Communist publications are launching a campaign in support of the socialist idea of the Pyongyang Declaration and are intensifying criticism on the Soviet and other opportunists who are lackeys of the imperialists.

The differentiation of the forces has become serious within the international communist movement itself.

The parties and their leaders that followed Gorbachev's "restructuring" are losing their prestige and their power of influence.

The bourgeois liberalistic essence of European communism is being laid bare. The communist movement is making preparations to advance to a new position for the anti-imperialist struggle.

The expectation of the anti-communist elements for the isolation of the WPK and the Korean people was upset. The anti-communist

publications are resorting to all kinds of despicable tricks against the political leaders who inspire and organize socialist construction.

Availing themselves of this opportunity, the opportunists are giving rise to various confusion. Bourgeois organizations for propaganda and the factionalists are skillfully using the words "personality cult" to paralyze the spirit of those who are wanting in experience and who have not been trained in the political struggle. This expression has been used skillfully so far in order to distort socialism in the Soviet Union and to disgrace the heroic pages of the history of the Soviet Union. This is because the officially recognized prestige of the active revolutionary leaders is on the increase.

Let us think together about the history of religion. Founders of religions are being respected. Large churches and temples have been set up for them and millions of copies of books on their ideas, preaching and doctrines are being published. For example, copies of books dedicated to the propaganda of Christianity are the highest in number and these books are being circulated throughout the world. Buddhism, Christianity and Mohammedanism have won the respect of many generations so far, because they called for justice, the protection of the weak, the respect for the old and filiality for the parents and promised such happiness in the world beyond.

How should we treat those who not only preach such happiness in words but also strive to embody it in the actual life on the globe, the life which everyone can enjoy only once?

How should we treat those who banded their people together, who emancipated them from poverty, absence of rights, illiteracy and subjugation by outside forces and who have led the people from the smouldering feuds of contempt, exploitation and subjugation to a bright future and to the sun?

Religious books demand that the exploits performed by each person be appraised fairly. I think that under socialism the workers, peasants, soldiers, scientists, men of culture and educationists should be appraised fairly on all occasions and everywhere. I think that many of those present here to attend my lecture are recipients of high state decorations and those who enjoy prestige and respect among the people.

If so, we should make a due appraisal of those party and state leaders who have mapped out correct lines and policies and are making efforts to realize them for the well-being and interests of the working people.

Under their leadership the Korean people built a new society and Korean-style socialism, set up the West Sea Barrage, an object of envy among the people of all countries, built new socialist cities, laid out good roads, succeeded in the research on new species of plants and have produced a large number of scientific and technical inventions and creatively solved pending questions at all times which arose in realizing the socialist transformation of society and

other grand undertakings, thus converting their country into a paradise where happiness blossoms forth.

The dear leader comrade Kim Jong Il said:

"The leader is the centre of the socio-political organism and its top brain, and he embodies the will of the masses. The relations between the leader and the masses are close ties of kinship within the socio-political organism combined with the sharing of the same revolutionary idea and comradeship. Just as we cannot think of the brain separated from the body, so we cannot think of the leader separated from the masses nor the masses separated from the leader."

Lenin's theory on the role of the masses, classes, political parties and leaders in history is concretized in and creatively applied to this proposition in conformity with the new historical conditions, the proposition which has been verified in practice.

The revolutionary cause of Korea is ever-victorious as it is based on the Marxist-Leninist principles.

The unity of the leader, the Party and the masses has brought about the rapid development of socialist Korea. The achievements in the DPRK become more patent when compared with those attained in capitalist countries. Many showcases, high-class motorcars and splendid houses are to be seen in capitalist countries. But capitalism is hostile to the working people, because the difference between the rich and the poor does not diminish but becomes greater continuously. Magnificent shops in Belgium draw only a few buyers. More than one million Brazilians in Rio de Janeiro spend every night under bridges or on benches in cities, because there are no slums. Such a phenomenon presents itself in a country not far from the United States where the President is advertising human rights to the world.

Workers in Germany have to pay nearly half of their wages for rent, but their houses are really lamentable. In capitalist countries families with many children live crammed into small rooms. There are many metallurgical workers in the Ruhr, but only a few maintain their lives until they reach the age of 63 eligible for old-age pension. Brazilian cities are full of motorcars but you can often see children between the age of 3 to 5 run over and killed by cars, while going about to ask for alms. Capitalism is good only for the rich. Even middle-class entrepreneurs are being forced out by monopoly capitalists. The living of the workers is so miserable that it is not worth mentioning. More than 50 per cent of the population are jobless in the territory of the former German Democratic Republic. A vicious cycle of the struggle for existence is making the people go from one extreme to another.

Your country makes a sharp contrast to all this: 20 per cent of the people in Pyongyang who have been provided with a new housing at the almost free price on the occasion of the great leader's 80th birthday, well-clad men and women in the streets, cheerful and well-

refined young people, an admirable combination of taste and modesty, a mastery of how to work and rest, a special concern for all children from the date of their birth, excellent schools, kindergartens and sport complexes, the schoolchildren's palace where as many as 5,000 children can develop their ability and talent at the same time, such impressive concert held at a palace where young actors gave fine and flawless performances, no crime, the cleanness and order in the streets, fine music blended with national tradition and contemporaneity.

It would be impossible to recount all the achievements in the DPRK. A high standard of the museum management, the reverence for the national and revolutionary past which gave the visitors to your country such an impression. Conspicuous is the result of the education in the revolution, class education and the education in patriotism.

Of course there are difficulties and matters to be tackled in the DPRK. They are debated freely in the Party and focus the attention of the mass media and arts. We believe that all these difficulties are transitory and will be overcome, and other matters will be tackled. Socialism of Korea has in life proved its vitality and application in the future. But of course this socialism should be defended and valued like an apple of the eye and like your father and mother. A telling blow should be dealt to anybody who attempts to do harm to this socialism.

Now come to the Soviet affairs. Is there any future for the restoration of capitalism in the USSR? Facts show that there is no future for counterrevolution in our country. Yeltsin's government has proved to be a renegades' group engaging in anti-popular policies. Not a single social problem has been settled. The economic, political and ideological crisis is deepening. The people's complaints and opposition are increasing. They have begun to realize that they have been tricked and to resist the reactionary regime.

Bourgeoisie is also facing a grave crisis, and antagonism is brewing in it. Hundreds of thousands of the working people are, under the red, patriotic banner, taking part in mass meetings and demonstrations. The working people's strike is multiplying.

The ABCP is ensuring that strike assumes a political character and that the economic and political demands of strikers are met. We regard a universal political strike as the basic form of struggle. A sharp class struggle is ahead of us. We are preparing it and express gratitude towards the people who extend solidarity to us.

What is the regime of restorationists rested on in our country? First of all, the reactionary regime relies on the Mafia's economic mechanism and Yeltsin has given it a full scope of operation. The vicious businesses have set upon forming monopolies. Capital of banks is coupled with foreign capital and is busy selling everything accessible in the country. Yeltsin is recruiting the entrepreneurs with

directors of factories whose monthly salaries have reached 150,000 roubles.

Our "wild" capitalism would never survive if it were not injected with foreign capital, plus "humanitarian" assistance. The petty bourgeoisie comprising small traders, banded thieves, swindlers, imposters, prostitutes, racketeers, paid-robbers, and other criminal snobs, all of whom reared by the regime, is supporting the traitorous regime. Therefore, each time some people of local governments and judicial institutes begin a fierce battle against crime, they are immediately crushed by their superiors. Political agents are protecting the petty criminals. This section of petty bourgeoisie is building up national "guards" and other bourgeois armed bandits. They are aware that if the people are allowed to participate in government, everything wrested from the working people will be reversed to the real owners. Therefore big bourgeoisie and criminals are on guard against the would-be consequences. These criminals have become the principal danger as the base for ever-growing fascistization of the regime.

What makes the present regime survive is that the reactionary political force has been regimented. The so-called patriotic, national bourgeoisie infected with anti-communism is ready to replace comprador bourgeoisie who is in power.

The conflict among bourgeois groups is developing into a conflict between acting Premier Gaidar and Khasbulatov, the "Chairman" of the Supreme Soviet, and Vice-President Rutskoy and State Secretary Burbulis.

The nomenclaturist capital of the former Communist Party of the Soviet Union is keeping up the process of capitalist restoration in a more quiet manner, and they are choosing Yeltsin's agents from opportunists who were Gorbachev's clients like Lukyeanov and Volsky. There is no end of the reactionaries' political farce.

In conclusion what allows the survival of Yeltsin's regime is the dispersal of forces opposed to restoration. More than a hundred parties have emerged on the ruins of the CPSU. Some of them are taking anti-communist stand, others are middle-of-the road, and still others have begun to form the front opposing restoration. Included in the latter is the ABCP which was established on November 8, 1991, based on the Bolshevik Programme of the CPSU.

Now the communist and socialist parties are organizing coordinating committees in order to achieve the unity of action in the anti-restorationist force. We are the sponsors of this unity and take an active part in these committees.

We believe that the day is not far off when the USSR will revive as the homeland of the great October Revolution and Lenin.

Historical lesson demonstrates that if we do not value what we have (often we have not done so) and lose it, we will regret this.

We Soviet people have overlooked opportunism and counterrev-

olution in our country and we are paying for it.

Dear brothers of Korea, we speak to you.

Value your fine socialist country. Strengthen the unity of the leader, the Party and the people. Deal a strong blow to the sectarian attempt, however slightest, within the Party, the attempt to undermine the political and moral unity in your country.

Take store of our bitter experience.

Korea has chosen its way to morrow, to socialism and communism. It has chosen the goal by itself and sticks to it. Korea is advancing with confidence and at a rapid rate, without having been influenced by others' preaching. Korea is advancing under the guidance of the WPK and of the great leader President Kim Il Sung and the dear leader Comrade Kim Jong Il, inspired by the enduring Juche idea and looking forward its goal.

The Juche idea and its principle are being acknowledged by the wider public in the world. They are being embraced by increasing numbers of the people. The revolutionary parties are being infused with this idea and principle, because the revolutionary evidences in the DPRK—evidence of the rapid development in a socialist country achieved despite the isolation which was both conditioned by the imperialists and created by the assistance of the Soviet opportunists—have demonstrated the tremendous potential of socialism of Korea.

In the course of this successful historical advance, intellectuals in socialist Korea who have come from among the people and been trained by the Party and who lead the scientific, technological and cultural development, have made considerable contribution. Korean intellectuals in the service of the people can be proud of their society in the construction in which they are taking an active part.

The professor-teacher staff, scientists and graduates of the university, the first highest institute of learning in socialist Korea, which bears the name of the great leader comrade Kim Il Sung, the founder of this university, took a special place in this work.

Imperialism has not changed its aggressive nature. So the need for enhancing political awareness against its scheme poses a crucial matter for the communists.

The opportunist leadership of the CPSU has ignored this need and has put the people into unheard-of misfortune and distress. It has deprived the policy of peaceful coexistence of the class content and has provided a theatre of activity to the anti-communists in the country. Nowadays everybody tends to think that imperialism is drawing upon its bitter experiences and will not attack with tanks and rockets. The major methods which the imperialists are employing are: to let the Party and the people pit against each other, discover the weak point in Party ranks, support sectarians, encourage careerists and conspirators, instil in the people uncertainty through ideological disintegration, trade on the partial mistakes in socialist

construction and distract the political ignoramuses. But these tricks cannot and must not be repeated any longer anywhere. There is a right remedy against every attack and sabotage by the imperialists. The great leader referred to this in his lecture on May 31, 1986. Its essence is to "defend the unity and cohesion of the Party—close unity around the Party Central Committee—like an apple of the eye and to wage an uncompromising battle against the tendencies encroaching on this unity and cohesion." Socialism or death! We are given no other alternative.

It is harmful to overestimate the power of imperialism and this leads to capitulationism. But nor are we allowed to underestimate it. Imperialism is destined to ruin in historical advance, but it still poses a great threat, poisoning the mankind.

The ABCP hopes that the working people of socialist Korea will make a further success in consolidating and accomplishing the socialist system, in quickly improving the people's lives and in the settlement of the crucial matter of the reunification of the country which is divided by the imperialists.

Long live the DPRK, an indestructible bulwark of peace and socialism in Asia!

Long live the Workers' Party of Korea, an inspirer and organizer of all victories of the Korean people!

Glory to the great leader Generalissimo Comrade Kim Il Sung and the dear leader Comrade Kim Jong Il, Supreme Commander and Marshal who have devoted their lives for the faithful service to the working people!

AFTERWORD

The situation in the country continues to be complicated and acute. The seats of people's resistance to the restoration of capitalism and plunder of the motherland by foreigners threaten to burst into all-embracing flames of civil war with the prospect of developing into a worldwide fire. The ABCP revived in the crucible of struggle with bourgeois counterrevolution strengthens its ranks and contacts with the masses of people, preparing itself for the grim class battle under the sacred slogan "For our Soviet motherland!", the slogan under which valiant soldiers of the Red Army fought battle and defeated the Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan. As in the legendary '40s communists-Leninists of the Soviet Union speak to all, "Just is our cause! We will win victory!"

In this struggle the ABCP will fulfil the international and patriotic duty of the heirs to the cause of the great October to the end. New and new fighters rise and the working people rally their ranks and the Soviet people are being freed from the lies of Gorbachev's perestroika. Political battle with Mafia bourgeoisie is fought not for the sake of glory but for the sake of life on the globe. As all the Bolsheviks of the party, the author of this collection of articles is on the march. This collection of speeches and articles is somewhat incomplete and seems to be broken off abruptly. I hope the reader will not be embarrassed by this. We hope that all of us and Nina Alexandrovna Andreyeva will find time for this.

Comrades, wish us success!

July 25, 1992
Leningrad

CONTENTS

Foreword 1

Future in Recollection? 3

I Cannot Give Up Principles 6

A Letter to Writer A. N. Rybakov 19

Open Letter to the 19th All-Union Party Conference 21

Open Letter to M. A. Ulyanov 27

Some Characteristics of the Crisis and the Tasks of the Society "Unity" 28
Speech Delivered at the Inaugural Conference of the All-Union Society "Unity" on May 18, 1989, Moscow

Who Are You, Nina Andreyeva? 37
Interview with Newspaper *Kupchinsk News*

Does the Crisis Continue? 43
Interview with Newspaper *Novosibirsk Evening*

The Aspiration for Truth Is Not Yet Suppressed 45

A Road to Truth, Truth Does Not Come of Its Own Accord 55

Let Us Prevent the Socialist Fatherland from Being Driven into Catastrophe 61
Report to the All-Union Seminar-Consultative Meeting, January 24, 1990

What Form of Perestroika Do We Support? 71
Talk with a Correspondent of *Soviet Patriot*

Report to the Second All-Union Conference of the Society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals", April 14, 1990 79

Socialism or Death! 95
Interview with the Newspaper *Komsomolets*, Chelyabinsk

Historical Caprices 104

Let Us Prevent Catastrophe! To Call Liquidators and Buriers of Socialist Motherland to Account! 110
Report to the Third Conference of the All-Union Society "Unity", October 27, 1990

Anti-Communism Is the Road to Reaction and Fascism 130

Syndrome of Involvement 138
Reflection on the Subject of Talks of E. K. Ligachev with the Correspondent of *Soviet Russia* Dated February 6, 1991

Arise, the Big Country! 146
Report to the All-Union Conference of Supporters of Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU, July 13, 1991, Minsk

Hostile Whirlwind Blows over Us 159
Report to the Conference of the Leningrad Organization of the All-Union Society "Unity", September 21, 1991

Oh, My Russia, Russia 171

The Current Moment and Our Tasks 176
Report to the Constituent Congress of the All-Union Bolshevik Communist Party, November 8, 1991

Speech at the Meeting Held in Leningrad, December 22, 1991 195

At the Political Crossroads 197

Speech at the Meeting of Patriotic Organizations of Leningrad, March 17, 1992 200

Realignment of Forces and Prospect 202

Is It Necessary to Revive the CPSU? 208

Speech at the Meeting Held in Brussels on May 1, 1992 212

Speech at the Commemoration of the Belgian Labour Party in May 1992 214

Anti-Stalinism Is a Trojan Horse in the Communist Movement in the Latter Half of the 20th Century 227
Speech Delivered in Belgium in May 1992

Speech at the Meeting Held in Leningrad on May 9, 1992 245

Some Lessons of Temporary Defeat of Socialism in the USSR and International Communist Movement 247
Speech Delivered in Germany in June 1992

On the Situation in the International Communist and Working-class Movement at the Present Stage 259
Speech Delivered at the June Plenary Meeting of the ABCP in 1992

Failure of Reformation or Where Is a Light in the End of the Tunnel? 265

Right Opportunism and Restoration of Capitalism in the Soviet Union 277

Strength of Communists Lies in Their Unity and Irreconcilability to Opportunism 289

The Cause of Socialism Is Invincible 303
A Lecture Delivered before the Teachers and Students of Kim Il Sung University, October 6, 1992

Afterword 322